

THE CANADIAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

Edited by John T. Saywell

VOLUME XL, NO. 2

JUNE, 1959

The British Conquest: Canadian Social Scientists and the Fate of the <i>Canadiens</i>	MICHEL BRUNET 93
Kingsford and Whiggery in Canadian History	J. K. MCCONICA 108
Lord Minto on His Governor Generalship	FRANK H. UNDERHILL 121
Arthur Dobbs and Joseph Robson: New Light on the Relationship between Two Early Critics of the Hudson's Bay Company	GLYNDWR WILLIAMS 132
Reviews (<i>see following page</i>)	137
Recent Publications Relating to Canada	177
Notes and Comments (<i>see following page</i>)	183

PUBLISHED BY UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO PRESS

REVIEWS

MITCHELL, <i>The Rise of the Revolutionary Party in the English House of Commons, 1603-29</i> ; MOIR, <i>The Addled Parliament of 1614</i> ; EUSDEN, <i>Puritans, Lawyers, and Politics: In Early Seventeenth Century England</i> ; STRIDER, <i>Robert Greville, Lord Brooke</i> ; YULE, <i>The Independents in the English Civil War</i> : by W. W. Piepenburg	137
MOOREHEAD, <i>The Russian Revolution</i> ; ZAMAN, ed., <i>Germany and the Revolution in Russia 1915-1918</i> ; RADKEY, <i>The Agrarian Foes of Bolshevism</i> ; SMITH, <i>Finland and the Russian Revolution, 1917-1922</i> : by Robert H. McNeal	142
HUGHES, <i>Consciousness and Society</i> : by H. N. Fieldhouse	145
WILLIAMS, <i>Culture and Society: 1780-1950</i> : by Walter H. Houghton	147
STRAUSZ-HUPÉ and HAZARD, eds., <i>The Idea of Colonialism</i> : by A. Feuerwerker	149
PORTER, <i>Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge</i> : by Gerald R. Cragg	150
GILEY, <i>The Political Thought of Thomas Aquinas</i> : by Gerald B. Phelan	151
MOSSE, <i>The European Powers and the German Question, 1848-71</i> : by F. H. Soward	152
ROSENBERG, <i>Bureaucracy, Aristocracy and Autocracy</i> : by I. N. Lambi	153
BAGBY, <i>Culture and History</i> ; MISES, <i>Theory and History</i> : by John M. Norris	154
POPPER, <i>The Poverty of Historicism</i> : by William Dray	155
SNYDER, ed., <i>Detachment and the Writing of History</i> ; ROCKWOOD, ed., <i>Carl Becker's Heavenly City Revisited</i> : by John C. Cairns	156
MELLON, <i>The Political Uses of History</i> : by Frederick B. Artz	157
VYVERBERG, <i>Historical Pessimism in the French Enlightenment</i> : by Richard M. Saunders	158
LOWER, <i>Canadians in the Making: A Social History of Canada</i> : by H. Blair Neatby	159
BRUNET, <i>La Présence anglaise et les Canadiens</i> : by Frank H. Underhill	160
LOWEY, et al., <i>Evolving Canadian Federalism</i> : by Eugene Forsey	162
PRESTON and LAMONTAGNE, <i>Royal Fort Frontenac</i> : by Guy Frégault	163
WHITE, <i>Lord Selkirk's Diary 1803-1804</i> : by W. S. MacNutt	165
JOHNSTON, <i>The Head of the Lake: A History of Wentworth County</i> : by Fred C. Hamil	166
HANSON, <i>Dynamic Decade</i> : by Morris Zaslow	167
JACKMAN, <i>Galloping Head</i> : by J. M. S. Careless	168
ALDEN, <i>The South in the Revolution</i> : by Max Savelle	169
MCDONALD, <i>We the People: The Economic Origins of the Constitution</i> : by Ezio Cappadocia	170
ARRINGTON, <i>Great Basin Kingdom</i> : by Wallace D. Farnham	171
SMITH, <i>Robert Lansing and American Neutrality, 1914-1917</i> : by Ramsay Cook	172
NOTED	173

NOTES AND COMMENTS 183

Nova Scotia's Bicentennial; Our Contributors.

THE CANADIAN HISTORICAL REVIEW Continuing

The Review of Historical Publications Relating to Canada

Founded at the University of Toronto in 1896

Articles in the REVIEW are indexed in the *Canadian Index* and in the *International Index to Periodical Literature*.

Communications with regard to subscriptions and advertising should be addressed to The Director, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Canada. Individual subscriptions \$4.00 a year.

AUTHORIZED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER BY THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, OTTAWA

The British Conquest: Canadian Social Scientists and the Fate of the *Canadiens**

MICHEL BRUNET

SOCIAL SCIENTISTS have the task of describing how human societies are built, how they develop, how they are arrested in their development, how they disintegrate, how they vanish. Such an undertaking is not an easy one. It requires long research, and much hard and fresh thinking about man's behaviour. Unfortunately, social sciences are still in their infancy. This field of knowledge has always been and is still neglected. For centuries, most social scientists were mere defenders of the *status quo*. They were entrusted with the job of vindicating the ruling classes to which they belonged or whose servants they were. Only a few thinkers did sincerely try to meditate upon the motives and interests which influence human history. Some reformers did unmask the false dogmas upon which the social order of their time rested. They were looked at with scorn, fear, or hostility in official and academic circles. One always takes the risk of being persecuted or ignored when one dares to question the social and political conceptions of the dominant minority.

We are now in the second half of the twentieth century. In the natural sciences, man has freed himself of all the fallacies which formerly impeded the extension of his knowledge of material things. Every day new frontiers of learning are opened to man's inquiry. But in the social sciences there has been little progress because too many social scientists have satisfied themselves with repeating the commonplaces, platitudes, and watchwords of past generations. They have not gone beyond the romantic period of the nineteenth century. Their vocabulary is a Victorian one. Others have spent their time writing long and dull monographic studies on minor topics and have missed the fundamental questions of their craft. Were they afraid to

*The Gray Lecture delivered at the University of Toronto, October 31, 1958.

challenge the social creeds of their time and to contest the validity of their forefathers' ideology? Was the power of the ruling class so overwhelming that they have felt compelled to keep silent? Perhaps the majority have been the unconscious victims of social conformity.

In any case, the result is that we live in a world we do not understand. We are almost powerless to meet the problems of our industrialized and urbanized society. Social scientists must reconsider their frame of reference if they want to make a real, scientific, attempt to explain the political, economic, and social evolution of the Atlantic world from the Renaissance to our confused contemporary age. A new approach is needed, and the need is urgent.

There are many proofs of the social scientists' failures and shortcomings. It is not my intention to draw up an inventory. I shall confine myself to an historical and sociological problem which I have long studied: what has actually been the historical evolution of the French-Canadian collectivity since the British Conquest and occupation of the St. Lawrence valley, and how have four generations of social scientists interpreted this historical fact?

With the help of France, and under the direction of their natural leaders, the *Canadiens* had organized a colonial society in North America. They had the legitimate ambition of developing alone and for their own profit the St. Lawrence valley. For a century and a half, they succeeded in maintaining their separateness and their collective freedom.

Being too weak to keep for themselves the northern half of the continent, the *Canadiens* were defeated, conquered, and occupied. Many of their leaders, having realized that their interests as a ruling class were in jeopardy under a foreign domination, decided to emigrate. The mass of the people could not follow them and had no choice but to submit to the British invaders who now ruled the colony. French Canada could no longer rely on its mother country whose support it vitally needed to grow normally. A colonial nation is always the offspring of a metropolis devoted to its progress. Deprived of this help, the *Canadiens* were left to their own resources which were very limited. Their new lay leaders had no influence in politics and business. Their priests became their principal spokesmen, yet the collaboration of the clergy was necessary to the British authorities and they skilfully managed to keep it. As a collectivity, the *Canadiens* were doomed to an anaemic survival. One must never forget that to survive is not to live.

Canada now belonged to a new collectivity. Having taken into their hands political and economic control of the St. Lawrence valley, the

British administrators and merchants—the cleverer among them—wanted to establish a prosperous colonial nation of their own stock. With the generous protection of Great Britain they succeeded. Their metropolis sent them settlers, technicians, educators, capital investments, and military support. A second Kingdom of Canada was born and it was British.

The new inhabitants of Canada, who first called themselves the British Americans, had hoped that they would completely assimilate the *Canadiens*. After the 1820's, some shrewd leaders of British Canada realized that it was impossible to achieve this aim. But they knew that the *Canadiens* had no chance of remaining a majority in the St. Lawrence valley. In fact, they were finally outnumbered by the British during the fourth decade of the nineteenth century. There was then no racial reason for delaying the granting of responsible government to the colony. The French-Canadian voters no longer threatened British-Canadian domination. The British political leaders and businessmen had the assurance that they would forever run the country they had built. The *Canadiens* had become a minority group whose survival the British majority had come to tolerate, with more or less good grace. Actually, they had no choice.

These are the bare facts. Now let us see what the social scientists have said. William Smith, who wrote his *History of Canada* at the beginning of the nineteenth century, gives an appalling description of all the wrongs the *Canadiens* were supposed to have suffered during the French régime and summons them to kneel before their British benefactors who had conquered them only to liberate them: "How happy, then, ought the Canadians to be, that God in his Providence, has severed them from the ancient stock to which they belonged, and committed them to the care of a Monarch, who, by making the success of his arms the means of extending his beneficence, has an incontestible right to their affectionate fidelity."¹ In 1828, John Fleming, a Montreal businessman and amateur historian, seriously maintained that Great Britain had waged war against the *Canadiens* and taken possession of their country "less from views of ambition and the security of the other Colonies, than from the hope of improving their situation, and endowing them with the privileges of freemen."² Fleming's testimony was approvingly invoked by R. Montgomery Martin in his history, *The British Colonies*, first published in the 1830's.³

Francis Parkman, one of the greatest romantic historians, did not

¹William Smith, *History of Canada* (Québec, 1815), I, 383.

²[John Fleming], *Political Annals of Lower Canada* (Montréal, 1828), lxxiii.

³R. Montgomery Martin, *The British Colonies* (London, n.d.), I, 15.

think differently. He believed that France could not give to the *Canadiens* the benefits of self-government because only the "German race, and especially the Anglo-Saxon branch of it, is particularly masculine, and, therefore, peculiarly fitted for self-government." As members of the French Empire, the "people of New France remained in a state of political segregation" and were kept in order by the armed forces of the king of France, according to Parkman. But, at last, the English Conquest

was the beginning of a new life. With England came Protestantism, and the Canadian church grew purer and better in the presence of an adverse faith. Material growth, an increased mental activity, an education real though fenced and guarded, a warm and genuine patriotism, all date from the peace of 1763. England imposed by the sword on reluctant Canada the boon of rational and ordered liberty. Through centuries of striving she had advanced from stage to stage of progress, deliberate and calm, never breaking with the past, but making each fresh gain the base of a new success, enlarging popular liberties while bating nothing of that height and force of individual development which is the brain and heart of civilization; and now, through a hard-earned victory, she taught the conquered colony to share the blessings she had won. A happier calamity never befell a people than the conquest of Canada by the British arms.⁴

Parkman sang this hymn to British liberty in 1874. Ten years later, he repeated that "civil liberty was given them [the *Canadiens*] by the British sword." However, his opinion of the Catholic Church had changed. He then regretted that the British conquerors had left the *Canadiens* free to exercise a religion that had transformed them into one of the "most priest-ridden communities of the modern world."⁵ As a social scientist, Parkman should have known that the ecclesiastical pre-eminence he noted in French Canada, at the end of the nineteenth century, was one of the consequences of the British conquest and occupation. But how many social scientists have realized that?

William Kingsford, who published a ten volume *History of Canada* between 1887 and 1898, had nothing new to say. He had learned well the lesson taught by all his predecessors. According to his preconceptions and the accepted historical interpretation of his time, the *Canadiens* had been exploited and mistreated when Canada was a French colony. But the situation had rapidly changed under the "British rule which first awoke the French Canadian rural population to the duties, the obligations and independence of manhood."⁶ Did

⁴Francis Parkman, *The Old Regime in Canada* (Boston, 1889), 397-8, 398, 395, 400-1. This book was first published in 1874. One must note that Parkman uses the challenge and response hypothesis. The latter has always been popular because it pleases the imagination, but scientifically speaking its value is very limited.

⁵Francis Parkman, *Montcalm and Wolfe: France and England in North America* (Centenary Edition, Boston, 1922), II, 427. This book was first published in 1884.

⁶William Kingsford, *The History of Canada*, IV (Toronto, 1890), 451.

Kingsford believe that the *Canadiens* had all been infants when they had lived alone in the St. Lawrence valley and fully enjoyed their freedom as a collectivity? In 1894, giving a survey of the colony around 1784, the same historian declared that the "rural population had remained unchanged in their social and political views, and shewed no inclination to accept the impulse of any modern movement."⁷ Should we conclude that the awakening of the *Canadiens* to "the duties, the obligations and independence of manhood" under the benevolent guidance of their fatherly conquerors had not been completed after twenty-four years of British occupation? Were they so ungrateful and unintelligent that they refused to co-operate in their own liberation? Kingsford did not concern himself with these questions. With the over-confidence and naïveté of a Victorian imperialist convinced that the British Empire, in taking its share of the white man's burden, had a mission to civilize the backward *Canadiens*, he stated: "It is plain that whatever be the ethnological character of the French Canadians, that it has been under the British government that they have attained to the force and power they possess, and have moulded themselves to the type they present. The political liberty they have enjoyed has enabled them thus to increase in number and prosperity." To back up his assertions, he recalled that from 1632 to 1760 the *Canadiens* had increased to a total population of only 60,000 while from 1760 to 1888 (a period of 128 years like the preceding one), they had become a people of 1,250,000.⁸ A high birth rate does not necessarily prove that a people is prosperous and free. Nor did the author take into account that the *Canadiens* had lived, since the Conquest, under the political and economic domination of the British *bourgeoisie*. Even if they were 1,250,000 strong in 1888, they were a minority group whose influence and resources were very limited when compared to those of the English population of Canada. A social scientist, who has an obligation to describe the actual situation of the collectivity he studies, is bound not to overlook, or hide, these fundamental facts.

Are the twentieth century historians and sociologists more realistic? Have they been able to renounce the political and social preconceptions of the romantic and Victorian eras? Old creeds endure, even among people who are responsible for the advancement of human knowledge. Man is so lazy that he does not easily change his mind. He feels so secure when he repeats the commonplaces and slogans of past generations. Smith, Fleming, Parkman, and Kingsford still continue to influence all the social scientists who write about French Canada, even those who have never read these old authors. The ideas of these earlier writers are part of an oral tradition which is carried

⁷*Ibid.*, VII, (1894), 195.

⁸*Ibid.*, IV, 502-3.

uncritically from one generation to the next. Nor does such a process only occur, as we are inclined to believe, among the lower and more ignorant classes. It happens frequently, too frequently indeed, in academic circles, where young scholars let themselves be directed into the well-worn tracks of their teachers.

Among the modern historians Professor A. L. Burt has devoted many years of his scholarly life to the study of Canada after the British Conquest. His book, *The Old Province of Quebec*, is still one of the major works in Canadian history. The author has enlarged our knowledge of this period. Unfortunately, he has contributed nothing new on the French-Canadian problem. Like all his predecessors, he has failed to see what was the actual position of the *Canadiens*, as a collectivity, before and after the British Conquest. He goes so far as to maintain that they "had been forced to live an unnatural life under governors of their own blood, but under rulers of an alien race they were to find themselves."⁹ He is sincerely convinced that the British occupation benefited the "French in Canada [who] were the first considerable body of an alien race to taste that liberty which is larger than English liberty and is the secret of the modern British commonwealth of nations."¹⁰ For him, the *Canadiens* obtained from their conquerors the "liberty to be themselves."¹¹ How can a people living under the domination of a conqueror be free? Has not Professor Burt himself noted that the *Canadiens* on the eve of the War of 1812, after more than sixty years of British liberty, "were now openly resenting the rule of their British masters."¹² One can then suppose that they did not feel that they had the "liberty to be themselves." In fact, they began to resent the British rule immediately after the Conquest.¹³ Their reaction was that of any collectivity living under the yoke of its former enemies. It cannot be otherwise. How can a social scientist overlook this fact?

Professor Edgar McInnis, whose textbook on Canadian history is perhaps the best yet published, realizes that the British businessmen, enjoying a privileged situation, "stepped right into the key positions in the economic life of the province of Quebec, and that fact made them of salient importance in political affairs as well."¹⁴ If the words he uses have any meaning, one must infer that the *Canadiens* were com-

⁹A. L. Burt, *The Old Province of Quebec* (Toronto, 1933), 12.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, 56.

¹¹The title of the fifth chapter of A. L. Burt's textbook, *A Short History of Canada for Americans* (Minneapolis, 1942 and 1944), 57.

¹²A. L. Burt, *The United States, Great Britain and British North America from the Revolution to the Establishment of the Peace after the War of 1812* (Toronto, 1940), 319.

¹³See Michel Brunet, "Les Canadiens après la Conquête: Les débuts de la résistance passive," *Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française*, XII (sept. 1958), 170-207.

¹⁴Edgar McInnis, *Canada: A Political and Social History* (Toronto, 1947), 131.

pelled to bow down before the economic and political domination of the British invaders. This is actually what happened. But the author does not seem to take into account what he himself has written for he asserts a few lines below: "The French had much cause to feel that their fortunes had been improved by the change of masters."¹⁵ Like all his predecessors, Professor McInnis does not realize that the *Canadiens*, when they lived alone in the St. Lawrence valley, were their own masters. Their relationship with France was that of a colonial nation with her metropolis which worked, in collaboration with the colonial leaders, for their collective benefit. Associated by force with the British Empire, they were reduced to the status of a subjected people. Great Britain had not conquered Canada for the good of the *Canadiens* but for the development of British colonization in North America.

Every book published by Professor D. G. Creighton is a landmark in Canadian historiography. In reaction to the nationalist school of historians who had over-emphasized the English Canadians' struggle to achieve self-government and depicted Great Britain as the villain of the story, he has shown what is the actual basis of Canadian separateness in North America and how great is English Canada's debt to its mother country. On many topics of Canadian history, his authority is, and shall remain, unchallenged. However, his approach to French Canada is still that of Parkman's. He declares: "To the defeated society of the north it [the British Conquest] brought fresh enthusiasm, a new strength and a different leadership. But this injection of new vigour, while it strengthened commercial Canada, necessarily raised the problem of assimilation."¹⁶ How can a "defeated society," placed under the domination of an alien *bourgeoisie* and engaged in a process of assimilation by its conquerors, become stronger? For Professor Creighton, the *Canadiens'* opposition to their conquerors' rule was merely a "struggle between commercialism represented aggressively by the merchants and a decadent semi-feudal society defended by peasants and professional men."¹⁷ The *Canadiens*, for various reasons, having not been completely assimilated by the British inhabitants of the St. Lawrence valley, Professor Creighton asks himself if the Conquest has not given a "chance that an older, simpler, more devout France, the France of the seventeenth, not of the eighteenth, century, would maintain its footing and even increase its influence in North America?"¹⁸ A society is a living organism, not a

¹⁵*Ibid.*, 132.

¹⁶Donald G. Creighton, *The Empire of the St. Lawrence* (Toronto, 1956), 21. This book was first published in 1937.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, 126.

¹⁸Donald G. Creighton, *Dominion of the North: A History of Canada* (Boston, 1944), 144.

museum. Is it possible to compare the influence which the *Canadiens* have had since 1760, in the St. Lawrence valley and in North America, to that they exerted at the time of the French North American Empire?

Among contemporary Canadian historians, Professor A. R. M. Lower has made a commendable effort to understand French-Canadian collective behaviour. But his interpretation of French Canada's history follows the traditional path. He has come to the startling conclusion that: "What saved French liberty was its loss—its loss in the English conquest, for out of conquest came eventually the English institutional apparatus of freedom—popular government and all the guarantees of the common law. . . . If the rule of France had not been terminated, New France in the course of time might or might not have drifted off to some kind of independence: what it would not have done would have been to secure the institutions of freedom with which it is now familiar."¹⁹ Does Professor Lower prefer the "English institutional apparatus of freedom" to freedom itself? As a political scientist who has studied with enthusiasm the liberal democratic way of life, he knows that a people cannot leave to another people the care of its liberty because, as he himself explains, "liberty left to others to look after turns out to be slavery."²⁰ A conquered nation that is unable to drive out the invaders and finally becomes a minority group in its native land loses its right to self-determination. For it, there is no independence. Professor Lower should have realized this when he once wrote: "Conquest is a type of slavery. . . . The entire life-structure of the conquered is laid open to their masters. They become second-rate people."²¹ It is evident that this author has not meditated long enough upon the historical facts submitted to his observation or the political principles he has himself enunciated. No other Anglo-Canadian historian was in a better position to describe accurately the fate of the *Canadiens*.

Sociologists who have studied the French-Canadian collectivity have simply repeated the historians.²² One must not criticize them too severely because, after all, what can sociologists do when historians

¹⁹Arthur R. M. Lower, *Canada: Nation and Neighbour* (Toronto, 1952), 49.

²⁰A. R. M. Lower, *This Most Famous Stream: The Liberal Democratic Way of Life* (Toronto, 1954), 9.

²¹A. R. M. Lower, *Colony to Nation: A History of Canada* (Toronto, 1946), 63.

²²See Everett C. Hughes, *Rencontre de deux mondes: La crise d'industrialisation du Canada français* (Montréal, 1944), 13. (This book was published in 1943 under the English title, *French Canada in Transition*, and translated into French by Professor Jean-Charles Falardeau, Director of the Department of Sociology at Laval University); Everett C. and Helen M. Hughes, *Where Peoples Meet: Racial and Ethnic Frontiers* (Glencoe, Ill., 1952), 114; Horace Miner, *St. Denis, a French-Canadian Parish* (Chicago, 1939).

give them false references about the past history of the society they observe.²³ Without the background knowledge that historians alone can furnish, sociologists are powerless. Professor Everett C. Hughes and all his disciples (and they are numerous) have much difficulty in trying to prove that the *Canadiens* have formed a folk society since the seventeenth century. In accordance with the old historical interpretation, these writers have convinced themselves that the British Conquest and occupation did not modify the social structure of French Canada. On the other hand, they realize that French Canadians, as a group, are in a position of subordination. They have discovered the explanation for this situation. For them, the *Canadiens* are struggling under the impact of twentieth-century industrialization. The former folk society of French Canada is crumbling and its members are painfully adapting themselves to the industrial and urban age. So speak the sociologists and anthropologists. They all agree that it is a toilsome and slow social process. A few among them think that French-Canadian society will melt away by integration and acculturation. These new pedantic and mysterious words are now used to name a social phenomenon which was formerly called, more accurately, assimilation. Others are more optimistic and seem sure that the *Canadiens* will overcome this ordeal. The political, economic, social, and cultural problems to which industrialization and urbanization give rise present a challenge to any society. There is no exception for French Canada. But one must never lose sight of the fact that a foreign conquest and occupation is the greatest impact a society can ever meet. How can social scientists ignore this fact when they study French Canada? Moreover, the Redfield school of sociologists should know that the *Canadiens* have never formed a folk society!

French Canadians themselves have been unable, for two centuries, to understand the actual causes of their ordeal as a collectivity. The first spokesmen of French Canada, after the Conquest, were obliged to collaborate with the British authorities under whose thumb they now had to live. They developed the habit of flattering their conquerors with the hope of gaining their protection. They gradually adopted all the commonplaces, watchwords, and slogans of their British masters about the rights of Englishmen and the exceptional merits of the British constitution. They spoke with scorn of the French régime

²³See also the statements of the following historians: Frank Basil Tracy, *The Tercentenary History of Canada* (Toronto, 1908), II, 557, 562; Mary Quayle Innis, *An Economic History of Canada* (Toronto, 1935), 63; John Bartlet Brebner, *The North Atlantic Triangle* (Toronto, 1945), 32-5, 48-9; G. P. de T. Glazebrook, *A Short History of Canada* (Oxford, 1950), 82, 90; Gerald S. Graham, *Canada: A Short History* (London, 1950), 63, 74; J. M. S. Careless, *Canada: A Story of Challenge* (Cambridge, 1953), 93, 100; Mason Wade, *The French Canadians, 1760-1945* (Toronto, 1955), 44, 47-8, 88.

knowing very well that such a language pleased the government and the British merchants. Indeed, the *Canadiens* who were responsible for dealing with the British administration and *bourgeoisie* were not free to act or think differently. They had to conciliate the invaders who occupied their country. The result was that after one generation, the leaders of French Canada had almost assimilated all the official thinking of their British rulers.

The Church did much to contribute to the dissemination of this British propaganda. One must always remember that the ecclesiastical administrators, whose influence was now very great in a society deprived of its natural lay leaders, became the most faithful supporters of the British domination immediately after the Conquest. By granting the Church a few privileges, the conquerors skilfully secured their devotion. The French Revolution strengthened this bond. The priesthood and all church-going *Canadiens* came to the conclusion that God himself had favoured the British Conquest of Canada in order to protect the Catholic Church of this country and the *nation canadienne* from the abuses and horrors of this wicked revolution. The British did their best to propagate this providential interpretation of their coming to the St. Lawrence valley. The French royalist priests whom the London government encouraged to immigrate to Canada from 1792 to 1802 were very useful to this end. Many generations of *Canadiens* have asked themselves with alarm what would have been their fate if they had been members of the French Empire during the revolutionary era. Even today, this question still troubles some conservative minded French-Canadian leaders who have not yet rejected the legends their forefathers believed in.

A speech delivered by Louis-Joseph Papineau, then Speaker of the House of Lower Canada, on the occasion of the death of George III, reveals to what extent the leaders of the conquered *Canadiens* had embraced the political thinking of their masters:

George III, a sovereign respected for his moral qualities and his devotion to his duties, succeeded Louis XV, a prince justly despised for his debauches, for his lack of attention to the needs of the people, and for his senseless prodigality to his favorites and mistresses. Since that epoch the reign of law has succeeded to that of violence; since that day the treasure, the fleet, and the armies of Great Britain have been employed to provide us with an effective protection against all foreign danger; since that day her best laws have become ours, while our faith, our property, and the laws by which they were governed have been conserved; soon afterwards the privileges of her free constitution were granted us, infallible guarantees of our domestic prosperity if it is observed. Now religious tolerance; trial by jury, the wisest guarantee which has ever been established for the protection of innocence; security against arbitrary imprisonment, thanks to the privilege of the *habeas corpus*; equal protection guaranteed by law to the person, honor, and property of citizens; the right to obey only laws made by us

and adopted by our representatives—all these advantages have become our birthright, and will be, I hope, the lasting heritage of our posterity. In order to conserve them, we should act like British subjects and free men.²⁴

Papineau made no distinction between individual rights and collective freedom. Under the British domination, the *Canadiens* enjoyed the right of property, although in this respect, one must not forget the confiscation of the Jesuits' estates and all the wrongs the other religious communities suffered; they could exercise their religion, but the bishop and all ecclesiastical administrators were subjected to close and suspicious supervision by the colonial and imperial authorities.²⁵ They were entitled to a fair trial when arrested, and they elected representatives to a House of Assembly with very limited powers. Indeed, there is no reason to cry out in admiration of the British administration. But the "English institutional apparatus of freedom" did impress Papineau for a while. When he tried to give some meaning to British liberty and claimed for the *Canadiens*, who constituted the majority of the population in Lower Canada, the right to govern themselves, he and his followers were crushed by British military forces. If the *Canadiens* had been entrusted with the government of the St. Lawrence valley, it would have seriously jeopardized the future of British colonization in North America. Lower and Upper Canada were united. The *Canadiens*, now reduced to the status of a minority group, had to accept the leadership of the British Americans who took control of the government of a united Canada. Papineau, LaFontaine, Morin, and all the other French-Canadian leaders of the 1840's did not understand what had actually happened. Some of them were naïve enough to believe that they had obtained for their people the right to self-government. The French-Canadian leaders who have since succeeded them have laboured under the same delusion. They boast that they have achieved Canada's independence for the *Canadiens*!

Social scientists of French Canada have not been more clear-sighted than its politicians. Men of action are not bound to analyse the social and political evolution of the collectivity. They have other problems to face and to solve. However, historians, political scientists, and sociologists have the task of giving a true picture of the society they study. With the exception of François Xavier-Garneau who partly realized what had been the consequences of the British Conquest for the *Canadiens* as a people,²⁶ French-Canadian historians have, in

²⁴The speech was delivered in July 1820; quoted in Wade, *French Canadians*, 127-8.

²⁵For example, the bishop was forbidden to convene a synod, and he could not travel abroad.

²⁶See François-Xavier Garneau, *Histoire du Canada* (4 vols., Québec, 1845-52), III, 296, 303-4; IV, 313.

general, adopted with only a few slight differences the historical interpretation of the American and English-Canadian scholars.²⁷ This fact is a striking one and it has never been adequately pointed out. It indicates that the French-Canadian upper classes have been engaged, since the Conquest, in a process of assimilation to English Canada. The assimilation of one people by another always begins with its leaders. But one has also to take into consideration that the teaching of social sciences has long been and is still neglected in French-Canadian universities. Laval University, founded in 1852, and the University of Montreal, a mere branch of Laval from 1876 to 1920, have never had the intellectual traditions and the financial resources required to become genuine institutions of higher learning. The situation has somewhat improved during the last ten years but there are still too few French-Canadian scholars carrying on fresh investigations in the social sciences. The low standard of education in French Canada has been one of the numerous misfortunes which befell the *Canadiens* since the Conquest of their homeland.²⁸ Too many people—not always ill-intentioned—who have deplored or denounced the ignorance of the *Canadiens* have overlooked the fact that, from 1760 to the second half of the nineteenth century, they were unable to organize a decent school system. France could no longer send them the teachers they needed and the French government had discontinued its financial grants to education. On the other hand, the *Canadiens* could not count on the help of the British authorities. Is it necessary to recall the fate of the College of Quebec?

Social scientists from both French and English Canada, and foreign students of French-Canadian history, have all failed to describe the actual situation of the *Canadiens* as a people because their frame of reference was inadequate. They have never seriously asked themselves how a society forms itself—especially a colonial society—and under what conditions it comes to maturity. How can it be arrested in its

²⁷See Michel Bibaud, *Histoire du Canada sous la domination française* (Montréal, 1843), 414; and *Histoire du Canada et des Canadiens sous la domination anglaise* (Montréal, 1844), 5; G.-H. Macaulay, *Passé, présent et avenir du Canada* (Montréal, 1859), 6; Philippe Aubert de Gaspé, *Les Anciens Canadiens* (Québec, 1863), 202; *Les Ursulines de Québec depuis leur établissement jusqu'à nos jours* (Québec, 1863-6), III, 349; J.-S. Raymond, "Enseignements des événements contemporains," *Revue canadienne*, VIII (1871), 55; Benjamin Sulte, *Histoire des Canadiens-Français* (Montréal, 1882-4), VII, 134; L.-F.-C. Baby, "L'exode des classes dirigeantes à la cession du Canada," *The Canadian Antiquarian and Numismatic Journal*, 3rd series, II (1899), 127; Desrosiers and Fournet, *La Race française en Amérique* (Montréal, 1910), 292; Thomas Chapais, *Cours d'histoire du Canada* (Québec, 1919-40), I, 3-5; Lionel Groulx, *Lendemain de conquête* (Montréal, 1920), 182, 183, 216, 232-3, 235; Gustave Lanctôt, "Situation politique de l'Eglise canadienne sous le régime français," *Rapports de la Société canadienne d'histoire de l'Eglise catholique*, VIII (1940-1), 56.

²⁸See Lionel Groulx, *L'Enseignement français au Canada* (Montréal, 1933), I, 37-58.

development and reduced to a status of mere survival? Why does a society disappear? These are the essential questions a social scientist must bring forward and answer to fulfil his responsibility as a scholar. Unfortunately, the social sciences have not yet shaken off the limitations of amateurism and romanticism. Social scientists are too often literary men who become students of society by accident, and their approach is often that of the novelist.

Factors of an emotional nature have also exerted a very bad influence on the thinking of French- and English-Canadian historians. The latter were in a very ticklish position. Could they admit that the British Conquest and occupation of the St. Lawrence valley had wronged the *Canadiens* as a people? Being rightly proud of the British businessmen and settlers who have built, with the help of Great Britain, the second Kingdom of Canada, their first objective was to relate their achievements with a patriotic bent. The history of French Canada did not interest them very much and they did not care to study it seriously. But they could not completely ignore the fact of the Conquest. Having a feeling of solidarity with the conquerors, they were inclined to vindicate their actions. Finally, they easily convinced themselves that the fate of the *Canadiens* had been better under the British rule than it would have been if they had remained in the French Empire. This hypothesis was a mere subterfuge but it had the advantage of giving good conscience to the English-Canadian majority. All conquerors use arguments of this kind to legitimize their domination over a subjected people. One must never forget that France had not conquered French Canada but had founded it and that the *Canadiens* could not develop normally as a people without the help of their metropolis. However, English-Canadian social scientists can be excused. Were not the principal spokesmen of French Canada—the bishops, political leaders, businessmen, and historians—all eager to proclaim that, after all, the coming of the British had benefited Canada and the *Canadiens*?

Indeed, the churchmen and lawyer-politicians who, for six generations, have led the French Canadians, like to believe that the Conquest did not impair the growth of their compatriots as a people. They stubbornly refuse to recognize that the *Canadiens* are conquered people whose survival as a collectivity has been possible because the conquerors were unable to assimilate them completely. On the contrary, they have endeavoured to persuade themselves that the challenge of the British occupation has even contributed to the strength of French Canada. It is said that the *Canadiens* have learned how to avail themselves of the prosperity and liberty the British are supposed to have brought to Canada. All agree that there were some difficulties

in the beginning, and that a few wicked British wanted to persecute the *Canadiens* and to assimilate them. But the *Canadiens* are told that, thanks to the cleverness of their religious and political leaders and their own courage, they have finally successfully overcome all the bad consequences of a foreign domination. The French-Canadian ruling classes, whose accession to their position of pre-eminence has always been dependent on the willingness of either the British authorities or the English-Canadian leaders, are interested in upholding this historical interpretation. Nor does this viewpoint displease too much the English-Canadian majority whose good conscience is not upset. It gives to the priesthood and politicians of French Canada the rôle of Saviours in the service of their people. It also magnifies the *Canadiens'* national pride. In any society vested interests and patriotic emotions tend to influence the writings and teaching of the social scientists. Too often they themselves are unaware of this social pressure.

The era of amateurism and romanticism is over. It is time to put Parkman aside. Social scientists should leave to the politicians and preachers the job of making pep-talks about the grandeur and virtues of British liberty, free enterprise, rugged individualism, and similar topics. They must approach the study of society with more scientific methods. They must state with candour and lucidity all the problems and challenges of our times.

In Canada, French- and English-Canadian social scientists bear heavy responsibilities. They must be conversant with all the political, economic, and social problems facing the Atlantic world in the second half of the twentieth century. Men of action who are entrusted with the orientation of Canada need their help to perform their duty. And there is in this country a peculiar problem that challenges every generation of Canadian citizens: the peaceful coexistence of the *Canadiens* and Canadians. This coexistence has begun almost two centuries ago. It seems that it will endure for many more generations.

Can we say that social scientists have up to now been equal to their task in dealing with this sociological problem? Was not their approach to it quite unsatisfactory? Their wishful thinking and their romanticism have impeded their examination of the fundamental facts that have determined the historical and sociological evolution of Canada. They have never perceived the true nature of the relations which have existed, since the Conquest, between *Canadiens* and Canadians. They do not even have the excuse of having promoted "national unity." A true and fruitful partnership between French and English Canadians cannot be based upon a common misunderstanding of Canadian

history and Canadian society. Empty words about democracy, self-government, *bonne entente*, and the riches which a bilingual and bicultural state is supposed to enjoy have too often deceived the social scientists of Canada. They have first the obligation to analyse the facts without troubling themselves with the vested interests they will hurt or the unfavourable reactions of the influential people they will scandalize. For the good of Canada, and Atlantic civilization itself, they have the opportunity, by studying with a fresh approach our own historical and social problems, to make a worthy contribution to the progress of the social sciences.

Kingsford and Whiggery in Canadian History

J. K. McCONICA

THE FRENCH-CANADIAN *mythos* is one of the best-known aspects of Canadian historical writing, and most commentators, both French and English, are agreed in tracing it back to Garneau's investigations in the middle of the nineteenth century. It is the story of a French colony which from the first was something more, "*un peuple en germination*," destined to fight to preserve its religion and nationality first against the Indians, then against the English, and after the Conquest against the assimilators. The colony is from the first a potential nation, a nation formed partly in the process of this struggle, but always drawing atavistic strength from the French spirit.¹

This tradition is conceded to have given French historians in Canada the unity of a school, while at the same time tending to confine their attention to the survival of *la race* at the expense of a conception of a national Canadian history, a subject in which many are professedly quite uninterested. Concern with this latter subject seems to be more exclusively the property of the English historians, who in turn have their own preconceptions. However, they are less frequently regarded as having a tradition of interpretation in common, and certainly there is no English Garneau for them to look back upon. At best there is a retired surveyor named William Kingsford. Writing in the last decade of the nineteenth century, without Garneau's style or sense of mission, he laboriously set down the story of the young nation in ten volumes.²

¹G. Lanctôt, *Garneau, historien national* (Montreal, 1946), 149.

²W. Kingsford, *History of Canada* (10 vols., Toronto, 1887-98), hereafter cited as HC. Kingsford was born in London, England in 1819, was a veteran of the Dragoon Guards, and came with his regiment to Canada in 1837. Most of his life was spent in various parts of the country as a civil engineer, and in 1873 he was appointed government engineer in charge of the harbours of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence, a post from which he was dismissed in 1879 by Sir Hector Langevin, Minister of Public Works. This incident was responsible for his first publication, *Mr. Kingsford and Sir Hector Langevin* (Toronto, 1882). There is a brief account of his life in W. S. Wallace,

Kingsford covered the same field as Garneau, and although Garneau was in his fourth edition while Kingsford was writing, Kingsford is still in his first. The competition from south of the border was too great, and no English Canadian curious about his history was likely to exchange the brilliant frontier saga of Parkman for the conscientious constitutionalism of Kingsford. Never heless, Kingsford is interesting and important. He is still the only English historian to have set forth the Canadian story systematically and on a comprehensive scale from the first settlements to responsible government, and his work had the merit of at least establishing the facts. As a standard handbook for his contemporaries, it must have been invaluable. Moreover, in Kingsford's views there is implicit a whole doctrine of interpretation which might well be said to have created a *mythos* as comprehensive, if not as celebrated, as the historical testament of François-Xavier Garneau.

Kingsford, in fact, provided the classic formulation of the imperial interpretation of Canadian history within the framework of mid-Victorian liberalism. In his work there are notions of primary importance in Canadian historical writing at the beginning of the century, and while there is no reason to suppose that their prevalence is due exclusively to the influence of Kingsford, his is the work which welded them into a coherent unity. To pass from Kingsford to the *Makers of Canada* series, the chief monument of this period of historical writing, is really to see Kingsford's work elaborated and writ large. But Kingsford's ideas are even more persistent than that, and it is possible to argue that subsequent approaches to Canadian history by English writers have never entirely escaped from his decorated whiggery.

At the beginning of Kingsford's industrious work there is a prophetic and significant quotation from Livy; promising to be "mindful of the exploits of the foremost people of the world," he declared that if his reputation should remain in obscurity he would, with Livy, find his consolation in the excellence and eminence of those who stand in the way of his name being known. The extract indicates his conception of the history he was to write, and Kingsford has found his obscurity, if he still awaits his consolation.

His first four volumes deal with the background to his main topic, the "history of British rule in Canada since its conquest from the French,"³ and the background is the French régime itself. For Kingsford, it seems to bear about the same relation to later events as the

ed., *The Dictionary of Canadian Biography* (2 vols., Toronto, 1945), I, 324, in which it is tersely observed of his history that while it is "not without defects, it was a remarkable achievement for a septuagenarian, and in many ways has not been superseded."

³HC, I, 1.

Roman occupation of Britain to Angevin government, but his treatment is none the less thorough, within this particular concept. Fundamentally, it is simply a chronicle of wars and explorations, strongly Protestant and English in tone, gathered together to demonstrate what an emancipation British rule must have been.

The terminal dates of his books give the character of the narrative: the death of Champlain; the creation of the Royal province in 1663; the expedition of Lasalle to the Mississippi in 1682; the history of Hudson Bay to the Treaty of Utrecht; and the history of Acadia from the Treaty of Ryswick to the Spanish war of 1739. These are the categories of an imperial history, and indeed one of the characteristics of Kingsford's work is a determination throughout, at whatever expense of space and coherence, to keep the reader abreast of contemporary events in Western Europe and the rest of North America.

Within the grand scheme of world events, the narrative proceeds with wars, explorations, and from time to time, administrative difficulties and quarrels. There is no coherent view of policies, although the only real glimpse of the colony itself comes from official reports. At no time very concerned with economic and social developments, Kingsford is most inadequate in this respect when dealing with the French régime. Thus Talon's efforts to stimulate the economic life of the province are listed without comment, and when he reappears in the narrative, on his departure, there is no estimate of even his administrative work. At the same time there is a long disquisition on the abbé Fénélon's involvement with civil and ecclesiastical authority, while most of the other questions about the life of the province go unanswered, or more accurately, unasked.

Kingsford's Protestant sympathies are unmistakable, and his particular dislike is reserved, of course, for the Jesuits with their deliberate attempts to influence the civil life of the colony. He favours the view that Champlain was a Huguenot, but makes very clear, without further comment, his later excellent relations with the Jesuits at Port Royal. Generally, the Jesuits and the Church provide him with convenient devices to account for the aspects of the French régime which he does not like, and the treatment of the Acadian story is characteristic in this respect. Kingsford views the Acadians as a simple folk without any very clearly developed idea of politics or any very fixed loyalties; the real villains of the piece, he makes clear, are those "who advised them and directed their consciences."⁴ The other guilty party in the sad story of the expulsion is the "home government of George I. . . for failing to furnish the military strength to put down the spirit of political insubordination."⁵

⁴*Ibid.*, III, 133, 136-7, 144.

⁵*Ibid.*, 145.

This is a verdict which recurs in the story of the American Revolution, and it points to Kingsford's faith in a strong colonial executive. He admires the French system on characteristic grounds, for its superior executive organization vis à vis the English colonies, especially in regard to matters of defense. At the same time, he castigates the total absence of political liberty of the English variety. As at all times through the long narrative, it is apparent that Kingsford is looking forward with considerable impatience to the reconciliation of these two opposites in responsible government.

This achievement is always at the centre of Kingsford's thought and values, and there is little, if anything, in the history which is not seen in relation to it. It is held to be the means of spreading the benefits of English institutions throughout the world, and it is scarcely surprising that the French aspect of Canadian history is seen by Kingsford less than sympathetically. The whole French period is, in fact, seen as a regrettable interlude, made possible only by England's surrender of the country in 1632. "Had England retained her conquest, it is difficult to speculate what the history of the world might have been." Nevertheless, it is evident to Kingsford that she would never have lost it again by force, that the settlement of the West would have begun much earlier, and even (without "extravagant surmise") that this fillip to British liberty and power might have led to a peaceful revolution in European political opinion, sweeping away the "arbitrary doctrines" of the middle ages without "the convulsions of the French Revolution."⁶ And to cap this, Kingsford proceeds to the arch observation that, "There is much to lead to the theory that the establishment of French power in North America was an event leading to important consequences," and that these consequences were "by no means to make more general, or to add to the force of those institutions, the primary object of which is the advancement, moral and material, of a people, and of their accompaniment, the universal yearning after rest and happiness."

In this atmosphere of a rather provincial Victorian liberalism it is natural that the history is little concerned with the society of French Canada, except to some extent with that of the aristocracy. Kingsford has a great weakness for a good lineage, from the abbé Fénelon to Lord Durham, and certainly the values of English institutions are never explicitly conceived in democratic terms. It coincides well with his love of a hero, in particular Champlain, beside whom he places only Wolfe, followed by LaSalle, Frontenac, Montcalm, and de Levis.⁷ The English values he cherishes are basically whig; in the midst of Iroquois wars the Glorious Revolution provides an irresistible diversion,

⁶*Ibid.*, I, 113.

⁷*Ibid.*, 136.

introduced on the pretext that, "The one item of news which disturbed Canada in the summer of 1689 arrived on the 14th of July, 1689. The Revolution in England had been successfully accomplished."⁸

"From this period," Kingsford observes, "may be traced all that we possess of liberty in the British Empire: freedom of religious thought, of speech, of political belief, or personal action, of individual liberty." The principle of good government was established, and true liberty has never receded, so that, "There is no Canadian in the Dominion, of whatever race he may be, that has not today cause to bless the memory of this Revolution, from the workings of which he enjoys the full liberty that he possesses."⁹ So, it is not surprising to hear that "French Canada had left behind no political traditions,"¹⁰ when the traditions sought are so entirely English.

Even at the Conquest, Kingsford feels that Amherst's government must have been, "in every respect, a relief by its contrast to the old despotic French government."¹¹ The Conquest is simply the triumph of good government, and is the great opportunity of the French. "It was British rule which first awoke the French Canadian rural population to the duties, the obligations and independence of manhood," and it is natural that Kingsford regards the supposed duty of the French to adhere to their language, institutions and laws as a "phantom," exploited by irresponsible leaders. The Quebec Act stands forever to deprive the French of this pretext for discontent.¹²

Kingsford's account of the American Revolution is conducted from substantially the same point of view, with the addition, for the only time in the history, of a strong emphasis on economic factors. Perhaps significantly, the revolution is seen chiefly as an aspect of imperial policy. The selfish and short-sighted commercial system of the mother country is the first cause he cites for the revolt of the colonies,¹³ and in his summing up this theme is swelled to almost deterministic proportions: "Had the prosperity of the provinces been allowed a natural and perfect development by freedom of trade, we should have heard little of those strained special appeals to liberty which were constantly paraded to influence the passions of men, discontented . . . with much that was around them."¹⁴

Linked with this point is the social pretension of imperial agents abroad and the discrimination against colonials in imperial service, which produced a frustrated educated class in the colonies. The other side of this coin is simple lack of appreciation of colonial temper, apart from purely constitutional considerations where he feels the right is

⁸*Ibid.*, II, 99.

¹¹*Ibid.*, IV, 444.

¹³*Ibid.*, 277-8.

⁹*Ibid.*, 100.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, V, 146.

¹²*Ibid.*, V, 244-5.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, 400.

clearly on the side of the mother country. Finally, there is George III and the "chaos of mis-government" in England which produced a vacillating policy and forfeited the feelings of kinship and sympathy towards Great Britain which the "best of the population"¹⁵ retained until the final blow of the Intolerable Acts destroyed their faith in the justice of the homeland.

The American Revolution for Kingsford is thus clearly an avoidable schism, where a more enlightened imperial policy could have saved the day. He is careful to indicate that on neither side of the Atlantic were there any irremediable reasons for separation, an important point for a history whose general thesis is simply that the Canadian development is that of the United States, but without tears. Kingsford, in fact, takes this opportunity to expand on the benefits of the imperial tie to Canada. Canada, he feels, possesses a "reflex of the greatness and glory of Great Britain; we, with her, are in the van of civilization," a concept which includes representative institutions and the efforts of Great Britain during the last half-century to elevate mankind "by inculcating self-respect, industry, honesty and thrift."¹⁶

From this point Kingsford's narrative is governed by the purpose of setting the stage for the Union and responsible government. Through the detailed and frequently faltering story certain unmistakable threads emerge: Canada is becoming basically British in every part, and the mass of the French is a simple, parish-bound folk, now absorbing English attitudes and institutions unconsciously. Politically they are innocent, but they are perfect material for the unprincipled demagogue who raises the fictitious cry of racial interest for his own purposes. Such a man is Papineau, whose whole aim is to rule Quebec under the distant suzerainty of the Colonial Office.

On the imperial side there is an analagous situation. Kingsford is required to argue that English institutions are not only essentially good but are the unrecognized answer to the problems of Canada, hence the Colonial Office alone bears the burden of responsibility for the constitutional crisis. Its "centralizing spirit" not only depressed the condition of the provinces, but "gave a false idea in the mother country of the character and attainments of the provincial."¹⁷ Fundamentally, he seems by now to see two well-intentioned and politically virtuous peoples kept apart by unscrupulous politicians on the one hand, and by a purblind officialdom on the other.

In these circumstances it is perhaps natural that Kingsford gives us no picture of the French community, apart from a brief and rather *a priori* description of the "parish." As a result, the disputes of Lower Canada and the birth of *Le Canadien* appear almost from nowhere,

¹⁵*Ibid.*, 299.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, 368-9.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, IX, 67.

accompanied by a vigorous denial that there was any spirit of French-Canadian nationality at that time. But, at the same time, he said that *Le Canadien*, "was the commencement of the effort to create the enmity of race which ended in the abortive rebellion of 1837," and that its motto was intended "to appeal to the patriotism of the *habitant*."¹⁸ Without this irresponsible agitation, it appears, English and French alike could have made common cause against the irresponsible British officialdom which often appears in Kingsford as an emanation of the Colonial Office's own incompetence.¹⁹ But as a result of the "injudicious conduct" of the writers who inflamed the French, the English "were thrown into political sympathy with the office holders, for whom socially they had scant love."²⁰

The analysis of the situation in Upper Canada is very brief, and is conducted within the same framework of ideas. Here, we are told, the years between 1796 and 1806 "do not offer any great field for comment,"²¹ the reason seemingly being that here the community is even more primitive and scattered. It is not until the end of Hunter's administration that "a class had entered the province . . . desirous of gaining emolument on easy terms," and these people are clearly the same who "had come from the United States in the spirit of adventure; among them deserters from the Detroit and other garrisons." "Such as these," Kingsford darkly observes, "had little reverence for British institutions."²² So this group provides Kingsford with the scapegoat necessary to maintain, as he had for the other province, that there were no real political grievances felt by the mass of the people. There is only an unsatisfactory piece of constitutional machinery, awaiting the inspired repair work of Durham.²³

An important aspect of Kingsford's view is that concerning American example, which appears at this stage only as a peril. Never is he inspired to draw any parallels with the experience of the former British colonies whose story he had told in such detail, and despite the fact that 1776 seems to him a melancholy consequence of the failure to discover the solution of responsible government earlier, he never turns to what might be instructive analogies. The agitation for an elective legislative council, for example, stems from ignorance or villainy or both; the "commencement of the application of the elective

¹⁸*Ibid.*, VII, 504.

²⁰*Ibid.*, VII, 507.

²¹*Ibid.*, 511.

¹⁹As in *Ibid.*, IX, 191.

²²*Ibid.*, VI, 518-19.

²³An unusually interesting example of this contrived explanation of the constitutional problem occurs in *ibid.*, IX, 191: "The prosperity, the wealth, the political power of the French Canadians date from British rule, and the political rights claimed by French Canadians were as born British subjects, under a British constitution, which none can maintain was fairly and fully observed, though not through bad faith of the British government, but from the want of knowledge of the true principle on which a province can be governed."

principle into every department." But where such a principle might come from Kingsford does not say.

The appearance of Durham, then, is timely and heroic. Responsible government is entirely his invention for, "No one in Canada advocated the remedy known as responsible government, the system under which we now live. At least, I can find no ground for belief that previous to Lord Durham's advocacy of its principles it had received any countenance in the Lower Canadian house of assembly."²⁴

Kingsford's curious narrative procedure may have something to do with this view. Volume nine is given over almost entirely to the story in Lower Canada, and is followed by an account of the Durham mission. It is only after this that he picks up the story for Upper Canada, and he seems to find little difficulty in maintaining his assertion. Clearly some sort of responsible government was demanded in both provinces, but Kingsford is certain that this is not responsible government in the later sense. Thus, in dealing with the select committee on grievances in 1835, of which Mackenzie was chairman, he asserts, "What was peculiarly advocated was the establishment of an executive government responsible to public opinion. One-third of the report was devoted to this consideration, but it failed to deal with the question with the practical good sense which distinguished the recommendations of Lord Durham."²⁵

So Durham is the last of Kingsford's great men. Responsible government is the whole answer to the problems of the day, and it is wholly Durham's idea. It is a type of interpretation particularly suited to history viewed as a constitutional conflict, and it is interesting to see how it leads him to implicit contradiction of his final prophet. Kingsford does not, like Durham, see "two nations warring in the bosom of a single state," but two almost characterless communities misled and misgoverned by a group of individuals. Thus union and responsible government pose no fundamental problem to the new country, and opposition to them is necessarily either deluded or factious. At the same time, the French contribution is, satisfactorily, essentially negative; they are a people in tutelage, and their highest achievement is to recognize the leadership of enlightened English whiggery. "We have only to be true to ourselves in the development and enjoyment of the prerogative of self-government we possess, to remain among the most envied of nations."²⁶

²⁴Despite this conviction that responsible government was the final gift of Empire to the new nation, he does observe (from an unacknowledged source) that Sir Francis Bond Head elicited from the Baldwins the view that "when members of the council failed to retain a majority in the house, they were bound to resign," *ibid.*, X, 349.

²⁵*Ibid.*, 330-1.

²⁶*Ibid.*, 100.

By the time Kingsford had got to his last volumes, he was receiving cool attentions from the newly established *Review of Historical Publications Relating to Canada*, which in its 1896 and 1897 issues criticized his inadequate documentation, drawn exclusively from Canadian sources, and his neglect both of uncalendared material and of "the daily life of the people" which now required the attention of historians. Nevertheless, it is not too difficult to find in his outline a great deal of standard English textbook material for Canadian history, and certainly in the great co-operative works which followed close on the heels of the Kingsford history no very radical departure was made from this basic interpretation. In the *Makers of Canada* series, despite the inclusion of Charles Lindsey's life of W. L. Mackenzie written from such a partisan Tory point of view that the *Review* would scarcely recognize its existence, the predominant tone is that of Kingsford, usually presented by a journalist, or at least a non-academic historian.

Some half-dozen volumes stand out for their maturity and scholarship: Jean McIlwraith's *Haldimand*, Parkin's *Macdonald*, Lewis's *Brown*, Shortt's *Sydenham*, along with Sir John Bourinot's study of Elgin. All of these are predominantly constitutional studies, economic and social factors receiving attention only incidentally except from Shortt and McIlwraith, although McIlwraith, without Shortt's scholarship, nevertheless presented a very balanced and convincing picture of the province under Haldimand.

However, Leacock's volume on responsible government best represents the general tone of the series. Despite its limited scope and reliance on secondary sources, it was an able survey concerned less with breaking new ground than with providing readable and sound introductions to the principal figures of Canadian history. It is unmistakably whiggish in tone; responsible government is the axis of Canadian history, after which Confederation is only a corollary.

The treatment of the French community by the English writers in the series (sixteen out of twenty-one) is uniformly conscientious, if not strictly sympathetic, and on the whole the provincial quality of the writing is not so much in the favouring of one community over the other as in a perspective entirely confined to the Canadian scene. British policy is treated in a perfunctory manner, American policy is generally regarded as a menace, and even with the constitutional issues, the whig view provides very little understanding of the English government of the first part of the nineteenth century. It is this interpretation, which makes the tacit assumption that in 1832 England received the parliamentary system of Gladstone which does so much to heighten the nationalistic flavour of the writing.

The predominantly Kingsfordian tone stands out in a comparison

of the two major biographies of Macdonald and Brown. Parkin's work is most sympathetic to Macdonald, but the sympathy was derived from Parkin's imperial interests; in his attitude to Macdonald as a politician, he was a Victorian liberal. Attention is drawn to Macdonald's nobility of aim, and the careful and almost conscientious allusions to his political techniques point up rather than conceal the more unsavoury aspects of his career, which clearly embarrassed the biographer. Virtually nothing is said of the realities of politics in Macdonald's day—there is no account at all of the political breakdown in the 1850's—with the result that politics are made to appear a great deal more sinister than they might have seemed after realistic and detailed investigation.

The reason for this unwillingness to examine the essential facts of political life is suggested by a passage in Lewis's work on Brown's decision to join Macdonald's cabinet: "Though Macdonald had outgrown the fossil Toryism that opposed responsible government, he was essentially Conservative; and there was something not democratic in his habit of dealing with individuals rather than with people in the mass, and of accomplishing his ends by private letters and interviews, and by other forms of personal influence, rather than by the public advocacy of causes. Association with him was injurious to men of essentially Liberal and democratic tendencies, and subordination was fatal, if not to their usefulness, at least to their Liberal ideals."²⁷

Clearly there was a feeling that Macdonald's Conservatism disqualified him as a true architect of the Canadian destiny. One leaves the two biographies with a puzzled feeling that Parkin missed an obvious opportunity to demonstrate Macdonald's superior grasp not only of the mechanics of politics, but of the whole national destiny, and an equally strong conviction that he did so because of a basic conviction that Brown was right about the institutions and the sort of community which was ultimately desirable. The preservation of diversity in national unity, Macdonald's great achievement, is tacitly condemned by the whig view; what is wanted is a community which is Protestant, English, and on the whole, closely analagous to that achieved south of the border by a revolution.

In general, the *Makers of Canada* series, designed to be a representative work of Canadian historiography in the first part of the century, is thoroughly a product of the intellectual predispositions which Kingsford exhibited. These predispositions were those of a Victorian liberal, pre-eminently concerned with constitutional development and the achievement of a parliamentary democracy. In the Canadian scene, this led inevitably to a minimising of the rôle of the

²⁷J. Lewis, *George Brown* (Toronto, 1906), 202.

French population, and within the framework of national development itself to a characteristic whig obsession with statute victories (1774, 1791, 1847, and 1867), to the neglect of local politics and the machinery of day to day administration. For the same reason, it dwelt on national accomplishment at the expense of affairs on the local level, most obviously by almost exclusive attention in the pre-Confederation period to the politics of Upper and Lower Canada. At the same time, the real difficulties of French and English relations were glossed over, and Leacock's conviction that the French-English problem comes to an end with the Baldwin-Lafontaine ministry enters this textbook history of Canada as a standard myth.

Behind this approach lies, of course, an implicit resort to American patterns of interpretation. The rebellions of 1837 are expanded to provide an analogy with the American development, but when the rebels do not really win, there is an embarrassing lapse before the attainment of responsible government provides the first fruits of a constitutional result. Moreover, there is the difficulty that Confederation, which the whigs tended to see as a corollary to the "real" revolution of attaining responsible government, was conducted and established by a Conservative Government with explicitly conservative principles. The whole argument is, of course, embarrassed by a dislike of monarchy and imperialism which emphasizes the independent and anti-colonial character of the Canadian achievement, but at the same time disapproves of the American example in order to provide a reason for independence from the American Union. Thus, although the attitude to the United States is generally negative or hostile, American institutions and successes are admired, and the ground of the oft-repeated loyalty to the imperial tie is never very explicit. Kingsford's exhortation to be "true to ourselves in the development of the prerogative of self-government" is, in fact, a meaningless rally, and the Goldwin Smith view, emerging about the same time, really provided a much more logical working out of this kind of thinking.²⁸

If, at the same time, the French historians exhibited as little sense

²⁸Goldwin Smith was himself impatient with the approach which saw in Canadian institutions simply a reincarnation of Victorian parliamentary democracy, a view perhaps most explicit in the constitutional writings of Sir John Bourinot. Dr. Norman Ward has brought to the writer's attention a letter from Smith to J. D. Edgar in 1895 (Public Archives of Canada, Willison Papers, 296): "In re: Bourinot, it seems to me that we are allowing ourselves to fall too much under the ascendancy of these Ottawa pundits. They are making a factitious mystery of their constitutional law. There is nothing here like the heritage of constitutional precedent and tradition in the breast of a British statesman or Speaker of the House of Commons. The Canadian constitution is a document not thirty years old, which every man capable of construing a legal document may interpret for himself. Alphaeus Todd was the first hierophant of this occult knowledge, and Bourinot seems to aspire to the succession. The tendency requires watching, because, as in the case of the Delphian Oracle, politicians sometimes get behind the shrine."

of context as the English, their particularist approach at least led to a considerable study of their own social history, whereas the English were concerned mainly with statutes and Great Statesmen, who were as unreal as personalities as they were incomprehensible as politicians. How could they have been otherwise with the neglect of provincial history, and such fundamental questions as the organization of majorities and the erection of a bridge between local interest and the national community? The essential poverty of the Reform tradition with regard to the fundamental problems of a community racially and geographically disparate was not explored or exposed in any careful fashion, and there was implicit admission that the Reformers were right about the kind of society wanted, Anglo-Saxon, laissez-faire, and democratic.

The core of the whig approach then was emphasis on the attainment of British institutions for Canada within an intellectual framework which tended to regard them as *per se* correct for all men. Thus the constitutional achievement of independence, involving the adaptation of government to a federal system, is seen as the ground of Canada's identity as a nation, and it is for her part in this that Britain is admired. It does not, however, provide a basis for further imperial attachment, and the characteristic attitude to further development of Canada is that of the radicals, a democratic, equalitarian, and environmentalist philosophy, essentially Jacksonian. The maintenance of this view required a denial, tacit or explicit, of the comparative immutability of the French population. The achievement of responsible government is then an analogue, but a peaceful one, of 1776, and the difficulties of postulating a true Canadian 1776 are ignored. Above all, the conservative merit of the achievement of constitutional independence, the preservation of unity through the mutual submission of two cultures to Great Britain, is overlooked. In fact, the characteristic whig resentment of colonialism often suggests that the imperial bond reminds these authors of the basic national problem which is insoluble in the frontier, environmentalist explanation.

This orthodoxy, with its frustrating and sterile ideal of "one culture" based on the pretense of cultural homogeneity, came to an end when it was finally impossible to square this ideal with the facts, and when the economic disasters of the 1930's directed attention to the B.N.A. Act and the economic factor behind Confederation. The discovery of this economic approach was a liberation, but has perhaps, in turn, proved to be a kind of covert whiggery. Discovery of the almost heroic unfeasibility of the economic aspects of the Macdonald achievement has led to some rediscovery of the excitement of 1867, but it has produced no new ground for Canadian identity. Once again the emphasis

is on the national achievement, now seen to have an earlier history in the creation of a trading empire in the St. Lawrence system. But the basic social and political issues and the local destinies involved in that achievement are lost from view in favour of a refurbished "great man" theory, and an adapted environmentalist explanation of the Canadian situation. In fact this view raises the spectre of lost economic advantages, perpetually abdicated to preserve the nation, without suggesting or really asking why this effort should be made. No more than the imperialist interpretation does the economic view discover a rationale of the Canadian achievement.

Lord Minto on His Governor Generalship

FRANK H. UNDERHILL

JUST BEFORE HE LEFT Ottawa in 1904, after a six-year term as Governor General, Lord Minto wrote to his friend, George R. Parkin, a long confidential letter on his experiences in the vice-regal office. The letter is conversational in tone and very frank in its expressions of opinion; it throws some interesting sidelights on the Canadian and Imperial politics of the time. It is preserved in the G. R. Parkin papers in the Public Archives of Canada, and the text of it is printed below.

Lord Minto was Governor General from 1898 to 1904. Earlier in his career he had been in Canada as military secretary to Lord Lansdowne in 1883-5; he had been in charge of the recruiting of the voyageurs for the Nile expedition in 1884; and in 1885 he had served as chief of staff to General Middleton in the expedition to put down the Northwest Rebellion. His activities in Canada during his own Governor Generalship have been dealt with at length by John Buchan in the official biography, *Lord Minto: A Memoir* (1924), and by O. D. Skelton in *The Life and Letters of Sir Wilfrid Laurier* (1921). Skelton and J. W. Dafoe, in his little book on Laurier (1921), are both unsympathetic towards Minto, and Skelton's review of the Buchan biography in the *Canadian Historical Review* (March, 1925) disagrees strongly with Buchan's treatment of Minto's part in the Dundonald affair.

Buchan gives a very attractive picture of Minto in Canada. He speaks, it is true, of the Governor General as being in a "partnership" with the Prime Minister in the government of the country, which is certainly not how Laurier or probably any other prime minister would have regarded the vice-regal office. But he explains how Laurier grew on the Governor General.

With Sir Wilfrid Laurier . . . Minto frequently disagreed, and was often exasperated. He believed that excessive temporizing for the sake of party unity was bad tactics even for that purpose, and he had little patience with the type of mind which seemed to be content to govern adroitly from day to day without any policy worthy of the name. But it is impossible to read his letters and journals without realizing that there was growing up in him a feeling that after all Sir Wilfrid might be right—that in a new land, with so many incompatible elements inside her borders, the slow game might be the wise game, that the time was not ripe for a clenched and riveted formula of Empire, and that the true solution might be left to the processes of time. At any rate, lover of decided action that he was, in his public conduct the Whig element in Minto dominated the Liddesdale impetuosity, and it would appear that history has vindicated both him and his Prime Minister. Of the affection between the two there was no question. (p. 205)

This perhaps might almost have been written of Lord Tweedsmuir himself, who used to address his Prime Minister in private as Rex. And what he says about Minto's attitude to party politics could probably also have been said about himself after his tour of duty in Canada: "His party politics, never cherished with much conviction, were mellowed and liberalized by an insight into the eternal difficulties of all parties and their curious alikeness in fundamentals" (p. 203).

George R. Parkin was headmaster of Upper Canada College in Toronto from 1895 to 1902. In the latter year he was appointed the first secretary of the Rhodes scholarship fund, and he was in charge of the organization of the Rhodes scholarships from then to the end of his life in 1922. Buchan speaks of the affectionate intimacy between him and Lord Minto; and this description is borne out by the correspondence between the two men contained in the Minto and Parkin papers now deposited in the Public Archives of Canada. They write frequently to each other; Parkin visits the Governor General in Ottawa from time to time, and the latter expresses in his letters more than once his wish that they could get together and have a long talk about public affairs. In a letter to his brother (August 9, 1899) Minto refers to Parkin as "a delightful man . . . the most level-headed judge I know of Canadian affairs." No doubt, the attraction they felt towards each other was to a considerable extent due to the fact that they agreed in opinion on most matters, especially on the subject that interested them both so much, that of imperial relations.

Parkin had made his name in the late 1880's and early 1890's as a travelling missionary throughout the Empire preaching the gospel of the Imperial Federation League. In 1892 he published *Imperial Federation: The Problem of National Unity*, a little book which contains the best answer given at that time to Goldwin Smith's *Canada and the Canadian Question*. His use of the word "national" in this title and in many of his letters shows that his conception of the nature of the imperial entity was far from that of our day. In 1893 he wrote a series of articles on Canada for the London *Times* which were published in a book of that year, *The Great Dominion*. In 1894 he reported the Colonial Conference at Ottawa for *The Times*. After he settled in Upper Canada College he became the special Canadian correspondent for *The Times*. He gave up this position in 1902 when he moved to England to take up his Rhodes work. "All his past life seems to have been purposely designed with the view of enabling him to assist in no small way to carry out Rhodes' ideals of fusing the various Anglo-Saxon Units all over the world into one solid and indivisible force." So wrote Lord Grey to his brother-in-law, Lord Minto, when Parkin was offered the Rhodes position (June 25, 1902). And on June 27 he added: "It is a call not an offer."

In 1904, when he heard in England that Minto was about to leave Canada, Parkin wrote to him on August 22: "I am anxious that there should be some fairly adequate review of your term of office when you leave in October. It never occurred to me till a day or so ago that this ought not to be left to chance. I therefore wrote to Buckle telling him . . . I would rather try to do it myself than have it left undone. I have just had a note from him saying that I may have a column and a half for the purpose. . . . For two years I have been out of touch with Canadian things. . . . I hope this gives me fair ground to ask Your Excellency for some help in this matter. If you would put together a few notes to make sure that I miss nothing essential . . . absolutely confidential. . . ."

Minto received this request while on a tour of western Canada, and he replied at once in a long letter written on September 7, 1904, while on the train travelling up the Fraser valley on his way back to Ottawa:

I can only say how pleased I am that the Times should think my career here worth whatever may be written about it. . . Certain points stand out. . . Most of them I have already talked over with you. . . From a personal point of view the most disagreeable episode has been the Dundonald affair. . . He was absolutely in the wrong, . . and not only that but he had put himself in the wrong by the course he was pursuing before things came to a head in his Montreal speech. . . The particular political interference he fell foul of was very slight—and there was no occasion at all for the line he took. . .—However people not behind the scenes jumped at conclusions and to a great extent I found myself standing alone in refusing to fly at my gover^{na}'s throat. I spoke out very strongly to them as to the disastrous results bound to follow on political interference into a military force—but as to the particular case in question I could not disagree with them—they were perfectly in the right—though the manner of their action might perhaps have been toned down—though even in this there is little fault to find.

As soon as he got back to Government House in Ottawa Minto sat down and wrote to Parkin the long letter of thirty-six handwritten pages which is printed below. Parkin in due course wrote his article for *The Times*, and it appeared on November 11, 1904. It sticks pretty well to general observations, making the main point as to the great influence which a shrewd representative of the Crown from Britain may have in Canada, but not giving any detailed analysis of incidents that would illustrate this point, such as the Boer War or the Dundonald affair.

Minto read the article when he arrived in England and wrote to Parkin thanking him on November 28, 1904: "It has always been a position, to my thinking, which can be made much or little of. . . In average times little may be done, a good deal of risk avoided, and no harm done—and no good. . . To me the position has been very full of interest—and generally left the impression very strongly on my mind that Canada is in a state of evolution, that there is much that has not shaped itself yet, and that unfortunately among her own statesmen there is no one directly steering the ship, and that she is floating about subject to many influences and undirected by a master hand."

Minto's letters to Parkin show that he, like one of the greatest of his predecessors, Lord Dufferin, had a genuine sympathy with Canadian national feelings, but at the same time tended to suspect the ulterior motives that might lie behind any specific expression of those feelings by politician or journalist. Lord Dufferin's suspicions of Mackenzie, Blake, and Cartwright were something like Minto's of Sifton, Scott, and Tarte—these, presumably, are the evil influences which he thinks he can discern inside the Laurier cabinet. And his impatience with what he thought Laurier's policy of drift, when in his view a great constructive forward step might be taken in imperial affairs, is much like Dufferin's impatient feeling that the Mackenzie administration were incapable of rising to the opportunity of their time in the consolidation of the new nation.

Minto in his letters had a system of punctuation by means of dots and dashes which is all his own. A letter which is printed exactly as he wrote it will have dots in many places simply to indicate a pause or the end of a sentence. This may be confusing to modern readers, since these dots when they appear in print are apt to look like an indication that the editor has omitted something from the original text.

I am indebted to Mr. Raleigh Parkin of Montreal, the son of Sir George Parkin, for calling my attention to this correspondence between his father and Lord Minto and suggesting the interest and importance of this letter of Lord Minto's of September 28, 1904.

Sep. 26, 04.
GOV^{NT} HOUSE,
OTTAWA.

Private

MY DEAR DR. PARKIN,

We only got back from the North West early this morning, and I am trying to send you the information you asked for . . . I feel it must be very egotistical . . . but I really value very much your offer to undertake a reference to the period of my service here . . . I honestly think that my six years have been very eventful ones . . . in which certain occurrences stand out clearly, each of them with marked interest in the history of the Dominion . . . and as to which I have necessarily had much to do . . . viz. the sending of the Contingents to S Africa . . . Memorial services for the Queen's death . . . the Alaska Boundary Arbitration, and the Dundonald affair—each of these involved Imperial considerations, and one might write much about each of them—I think however it will be best for me to give you a short note as to each, and you can of course form your own conclusions as to the position I took up. Besides these salient points there have been many others of great interest with which I have had much to do. But speaking generally, I think what I should like to make most clear is the position I have taken up with 'my ministers' on matters of public importance . . . viz. always to express my views as openly and as decidedly as I could on all matters upon which I have been consulted—and though it may sound conceited I have been consulted about everything of any moment, and I am sure you will understand the pleasure it is to me to feel that the longer I have been here, the greater weight I have been able to bring to bear . . . I have however always assumed the position, in matters of importance, that there were two classes into which questions placed before me resolved themselves . . . viz. Imperial questions, and purely Canadian questions—as regards the former I have always claimed my right to assert myself, i.e. to put my foot down, if I suspected anything detrimental to Imperial interests, whilst as to Canadian questions however important, I have only expressed my opinion as strongly as I could, simply as my opinion, for what it was worth, telling the minister interested that such was my opinion and that he could take it or not as he liked—as an example, when the first contingent was being organized for S. Africa, I suspected possible political interests in the appointment of senior officers . . . as to which I let it be understood in the strongest language that as on arrival in S. Africa the troops were to be paid by H. M.'s gov^{nt}, and as the lives of men in an Imperial war would depend on the efficiency of officers sent from here, I would decline to recommend to H. M.'s gov^{nt} the appointment of officers I thought incapable.—

On the other hand, in respect to the Coronation Contingent, an officer was appointed to the command with none of the qualifications I thought necessary for the position.¹ After a great war, one naturally expected that the Coronation Contingents from the colonies, would be commanded by representative officers who had distinguished themselves, and whose services in many cases were well known throughout the Empire. . . In Canada an officer was selected to command the contingent who had seen no service whatever, but who had by Stock Exchange manipulation made much money for people in high places . . . I expressed my dis-

¹The reference is to Lt. Col. H. M. Pellatt of Toronto, who later became Sir Henry Pellatt. He is chiefly remembered for the pseudo-mediaeval castle which he built for his private residence on the Pellatine Hill and which is now the main historical monument in Toronto.

approval strongly, pointing out that I thought Canadians would not be happy when they saw such an officer march past at the head of Canadian soldiers who had fought through any number of actions . . . The Australian and N. Zealand contingents being led across the Horse Guards Parade by their well known commanders . . . but I said it's no Imperial affair, you can send who you like and they sent so-and-so . . . Sir Wilfrid coming to me, and telling me too late that he entirely agreed with me . . . but the stock broker went, and the result was not satisfactory—but it was not an Imperial affair—it rested simply with the gov^{nt} of Canada to send who they liked—I felt entitled to express my opinion, but no more—On the other hand, in questions such as the appointment of officers to the S. African Constabulary . . . this being an Imperial force . . . the recommendations for commissions were placed *entirely* in my hands, with no reference to my gov^{nt} . . . but though of course I assumed the responsibility of recommendations, I always consulted my ministers before submitting them . . . so that we really worked quite smoothly together—I have often suspected that in their hearts my ministers were glad that the responsibility rested on me—These are military questions, but as you may imagine there are many of the same sort of a civilian nature, where the Governor General may draw the distinction between the Imperial and Canadian conditions and assert himself or not accordingly—

There is one matter which I think of great public importance, and which I have always kept entirely in my own hands—viz. recommendations for 'honours'. They are most difficult and disagreeable things to deal with, and a section of the Cabinet is very anxious to obtain the manipulation of them . . . in fact go so far as claiming that honours should be submitted to the King by Order-in-Council—and with a Governor General who did not assert himself or did not recognize the meaning of this in a politically tyrannized country, this might very easily be brought about . . . I had much private correspondence with Mr. Chamberlain about this . . . the result being a despatch from him which embodies my views for we entirely agreed, & remains here for future guidance . . . it recognizes the entire responsibility of the Governor General alone for recommendation of honours . . . of course he consults with his Prime Minister, but he must be prepared to act off his own bat . . . You would be astonished if you knew the paltry objections raised here to the bestowal of well deserved honours—but I have always recommended exactly as I myself thought fit—irrespective of any opposition—You will I am sure understand how intensely important this is if we wish to keep the bestowal of honours out of the hands of Canadian party politicians . . . I have of course recognized that a Prime Minister necessarily wishes to 'honour' party services, and on Sir Wilfrid suggesting any of his supporters to me I have never had reason to object to them—but outside political honours there is the question of the recognition by the King of military, literary, artistic and business ability . . . This I have always claimed is absolutely distinct from political qualifications and I have insisted, sometimes in the face of the strongest opposition from my ministers, in making my recommendations according to merit alone.²

²On the question of honours there are two important private letters from Chamberlain to Minto in the Minto papers, dated May 18, 1901, and March 25, 1902. The Colonial Secretary lays down that on these questions the Governor General should consult only the Prime Minister among his advisers, and that in the end he himself is alone responsible for the recommendations that come from Canada. The Laurier Government expressed its views in an Order-in-Council of February 9, 1902, complaining that the exercise of the royal prerogative in this matter had not yet been brought into harmony with the principles of parliamentary government, and claiming that the practice should conform with the well understood principles of ministerial responsibility; it

I think I have said enough to give you an idea of the course I have tried to pursue . . . I have always been on excellent terms with my ministers . . . but they know quite well I will say what I think. . . as to their Imperial feelings it may be worth while to say a word . . . one cannot disguise from oneself that whatever their public professions may be, in the great questions to which I have alluded their bias has been anti-Imperial—viz. they had decided not to send 'the contingents' but were carried off their legs by Canadian public opinion and they had to do so.

They refused to pay any official recognition at Ottawa to the memory of the Queen. This was not French Canadian opposition, as at Quebec there was an official memorial service in the English Cathedral, supported by the French Prime Minister & Mayor, and attended by him and the French Roman Catholic officers in uniform.³

Whilst in the Alaska Boundary decision, it is impossible to believe that Jetté's and Aylesworth's letters to the Times were written on their own initiative,⁴ I have not the slightest doubt that they were inspired by someone in authority. They could only tend to produce bad blood between Canada and the Mother Country, and I have no doubt at all that there was a wish in certain quarters to do so . . . In fact there was an element in the Canadian representation of the Alaska case of which I was very suspicious. I had doubts of its reliability in the service of Canada or the Empire—I would rather explain more explicitly when I see you.

This underhand anti-Imperial current I am constantly meeting . . . I believe it emanates from strong influences in the Cabinet—its tendency though very carefully disguised and cleverly worked is I should say towards annexation—Possibly

asked, therefore, that the Royal Instructions on the subject be modified. Chamberlain in a despatch of April 23, 1902 (in answer to the Governor General's confidential despatch of March 4, 1902), declared that the Canadian ministry were the proper authorities for making recommendations for services rendered solely in the sphere for which the Canadian ministers were responsible, and that the Governor General in transmitting such recommendations should accompany them by his own observations; but that in other cases the initiative should be with the Governor General who with his recommendations should transmit the remarks of his Prime Minister. He added that "since the responsibility rests with the Secretary of State, it is his duty to obtain the best advice he can, and he must be the sole judge of what is the best advice." This was, of course, to deny the claim of the Laurier Government. Sir Robert Borden quoted these documents in the debate of 1918 in the House of Commons on the subject of honours (vol. I, 493, April 8).

³Buchan tells us that it was Scott who objected to a formal official service for Queen Victoria on the ground that Canada had no established church. In the end Scott himself attended a service in the Roman Catholic Basilica, while the Governor General went to one in the Church of England Cathedral accompanied by some of his ministers (including Tartel!).

⁴Aylesworth and Jetté, when they refused to sign the award of the Alaska commissioners, issued a joint statement which was published in the British papers and appears in the Toronto *Globe* of October 21, 1903. The same issue of the *Globe* reports from London "a Canadian who has been most intimately and prominently associated with the Alaska case" (Sifton ?) as saying: "It is the hardest blow the Imperial idea has ever received. The place Lord Alverstone filled was clearly that of an agent of the British government. . . Canada has been not only spontaneous but zealous in the defence of British territory, and has not hesitated to sacrifice blood and treasure in defence of the motherland. She must now face the fact that when Imperial interest or friendships require it, her territory will be handed over without the slightest hesitation. This marks a most serious epoch in the relations between Canada and the mother country." The news of the Alaska award was published in Canadian papers which were full of Chamberlain's campaign for tariff reform.

you may have seen an article on Canada some months ago in the *Contemporary Review* by Farrer,⁵ (I can't put my hands on the number) but Farrer is I understand, the Ottawa correspondent of the *Economist*, from which there is a long quotation in today's *Citizen* . . . both articles are worth reading—strongly anti-Imperial and undoubtedly written by direction . . . I dare say you know of Farrer . . . He has a reputation as a clever, unscrupulous writer, ready to write as he is bid . . . I rather think he has been on the staff of both the *Globe*, and the *Mail & Empire* . . . He was, and probably still is in the pay of the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate, and was the backstairs correspondent of my gov^{nt} with Washington during the Alaska negotiations . . . He is employed in some capacity here now, and is hand in glove with the gov^{nt} . . . All this is I feel digressive as to my own position as to which you have asked, but it is a condition of affairs which I have had to watch.

As to Sir Wilfrid . . . he is to me a personal friend. I believe him to be a thorough admirer of the British Constitution and that he fully recognizes the greatness of Imperial possibilities . . . but the intensity of British feeling is not in his blood . . . he never shows any inclination to *lead* in an Imperial direction—in conversation with me he is more inclined to speculate on the future, and to wonder what the great prosperity and increasing population of Canada is ultimately to lead to . . . and he is very willing to shut his eyes to what is unpleasant—and very easily influenced—In my opinion he might do much more than he has done to enlighten public opinion in French Canada on his Imperial position . . . but notwithstanding Imperial ignorance in French Canada and the handicap it has often proved to Imperial sympathies, I believe myself there are more dangerous elements as regards the future amongst certain English speaking elements than amongst the French Canadians . . .

As to the 'bias' of my gov^{nt} which I have mentioned, I mean the anti-imperial inclination—it is in no way in sympathy with the general feeling of the Canadian people . . . it emanates to a great extent, I believe, from some factor in the Cabinet which Sir Wilfrid has not sufficiently combatted . . . it is very subtle . . . but I see many indications of it . . . viz. as to the possibility of the Marlboroughs succeeding us here . . . The appointment would have been practically impossible in the general state of Canadian feeling towards the U.S.⁶ . . . and I have no doubt Sir Wilfrid would have objected to it . . . yet the only Canadian paper that supported the suggestion was the *Ottawa Free Press*, which is supposed to be the gov^{nt} organ here and is to some extent owned by Americans.

As to the feeling of Canadian nationality which is as you know very strong . . . I have always in my public speeches sympathized with it . . . If I was Canadian born I should be strongly Canadian—in the sense that being Scotch I am strongly

⁵Edward Farrer's article, *Canada and the New Imperialism*, appeared in the *Contemporary Review* for December, 1903. The *Economist* of September 10, 1904 published an article from a special correspondent in Ottawa on the Chamberlain proposals, to which the *Ottawa Citizen* of September 27 referred in very hostile terms. On Edward Farrer see J. S. Willison, *Reminiscences*, chap. ix. While Farrer was certainly much addicted to underground activities, these two articles of his are simply very trenchant statements of the Canadian nationalist point of view, and they can be paralleled by many similar articles written during the 1880's, 1890's, and early 1900's by Canadian Liberals in answer to the arguments of the Imperial Federation League and of the Chamberlainites. The only significant difference between Farrer's articles and these others is that his are better written, since he was the most brilliant Canadian journalist of his time.

⁶The Duke of Marlborough had married Consuelo Vanderbilt.

Scotch . . and I think many people would be more reasonable if they admitted the justice of this in the case of the French Canadians . . I do not think that the old historical traditions of a race need to be obliterated. I know there is much to be said for complete assimilation of races as in the population of the U.S. . . but I do not see that the encouragement of Canadian nationality need militate against Imperial interests, unless the Canadian sentiment is foolishly exaggerated . . (You may see what I say as to this in my speech at the Canada Club enclosed.)

As regards "closer Imperial relations"—from all conversations I have had here, the possibility of Canadian representation in an Imperial Parliament or even a permanent Imperial Council must in my opinion remain outside practical politics for a long time to come . . the Council of course is the most feasible of the two—but for the present closer relations depend upon a proper appreciation at home of the two great questions, viz.

- a) preferential trade between the Mother Country and the Dominion—
- b) Imperial Defence—

As to the first, you know the position better than I do—I believe Sir Wilfrid and Fielding are perfectly sound in their wish to bring it about—In their conversations with me they invariably claim that the resolution proposed by Sir Wilfrid and passed unanimously at the Colonial Conference⁷ was a clear exposition of their views . . and they do not see why they should be expected to keep on publicly repeating them . . . We have also the opinions of Chambers of Commerce and other Commercial bodies and the votes of Provincial Legislatures— . . but in the meantime things are hanging fire in the old country . . and there is every reason to apprehend advances from the U.S. in the direction of reciprocity . . . So far Sir Wilfrid's position in talking privately to me has been that the States are impossible to deal with—in fact he says "they never play fair,—we will make no advances to them . . it rests with them to do so". But what he will do if the U.S. *do* make reciprocity proposals I cannot say . . He is in a position to say "we have made advances to the mother country and have met with no response,—here are the U.S. making proposals, and we must look out for ourselves" . . To my mind the position is most serious—our opportunity is disappearing owing to lack of understanding at home—I agree with Sir John Macdonald that reciprocity with the U.S. is 'veiled treason'. It would be the beginning of the end—

As to Imperial Defence—Canadian public opinion is pronouncedly adverse to any pledge or bargain by which the Dominion should bind herself to supply men or money to an Imperial war . . I have not the slightest doubt that it would be a serious mistake to ask any Canadian gov^{nt} to do so . . under present conditions we should get much more by leaving the question of Imperial military co-operation to the sentiment of the Canadian people—

On the other hand it has been in our power to encourage that sentiment, and again we are losing the opportunity . . . It is impossible to expect Canadian officers to go on fighting for us in Imperial wars, unless they share in Imperial professional rewards (not medals & decorations, but professional advancement in the service of the Empire) . . I quite know how difficult this is to bring about in the midst of all existing competition for military advancement—but as it happens there has been peculiar opportunity here, by the existence of Halifax and Esquimalt—with an Imperial Lt. General in supreme military command in Canada the Canadian militia might have been placed under a Canadian officer with the rank of Major General whilst the executive commands and staff appointments at Halifax and Esquimalt could have been thrown open to Canadian officers *on the*

⁷The Colonial Conference of 1902.

recommendation of the Imperial Lt. General in supreme command of H. M's troops and militia, these selected Canadian officers then coming under Imperial control—There has, I am sorry to say, been an inclination at home lately to hand over the fortresses of Halifax & Esquimalt body & soul to the Dominion—This for various reasons I have strongly opposed. The suggestion I make would have I believe been very acceptable here . . . but I have found it impossible to arouse interest in the question at home—and I am sorry to say recent action of the home authorities in military matters here has made the position much more difficult. My wish has always been to encourage and help on good Canadian officers in the Imperial sense . . . *It must be done* if we are to retain their services—

As regards my dealings with the Militia Dep^{ty} generally—though there is still a great deal to be desired much has been done . . . the political influence which has been so injurious to it is decidedly on the decline, its evil effects are becoming more clearly recognized . . . and I can only say that Borden⁸ in his dealings with me has been very open, he has consulted me about everything of importance and has placed confidential matters before me which he was not necessarily called upon to do. I have had plenty of difficulties with his Dep^{ty}, but I cannot call to mind a single case of objection on my part on which I have not gained my point . . . The new Militia Act⁹ was withdrawn several times at my request, and the amended Act only passed the House this year because during Borden's visit to England the home authorities agreed to all his suggestions in entire disregard of what I had told them,—I could then no longer object to Borden's proposals, and my only course was to help the new order of things as well as I could—the Militia Council idea as now adopted here is I think on the right lines—I am answerable to a great extent for its adoption . . . owing to a prolonged state of friction the possibility of continuing the system of an Imperial officer in command of this Militia was very doubtful, but the clause in the Act making this necessary ought never to have been cancelled without full consideration of the position, when we might have bargained (whilst withdrawing the direct command) for the employment of some Imperial officer on the Militia Council for advisory and educational purposes . . . The action taken in London was most unfortunate in various ways—but I have now done all I could to assist Borden to obtain Col. Lake¹⁰ as Chf. of his Staff and he is to come for 6 months. The action of the home authorities was one of the primary causes of the Dundonald difficulty. He would not recognize the change must come, but seemed to think he could upset the decision of the War Office or render it ineffectual, and was determined to do all he could to thwart the Militia Council proposals.

There is no reason to give you any account of the Dundonald story. . . It was very much misunderstood by the Canadian public. . . he was made a catpaw of by the opposition, and will be a plank in the general election now coming on . . . an entirely wrong position for an Imperial officer to be in.

I had known for a long time that his position with Borden was becoming worse and worse, owing largely to Dundonald's peculiarities . . . The final rupture ought never to have occurred . . . it was easily adjustable. It arose from *my having pointed out* to Dundonald an irregularity in a Militia Gazette, as to which I asked for his

⁸Dr. Frederick Borden, the Minister of Militia.

⁹The Militia Act of 1904 established a Militia Council modelled on the new Army Council in Britain.

¹⁰The old position of Commander in Chief, held by a British officer, was abolished, and a Chief of the General Staff was substituted. This office was held by Sir Percy Lake from 1905 to 1908; he was Inspector General from 1908 to 1910.

opinion . . . He never communicated with me at all, but rushed at once into his Montreal speech . . . Subsequently he was quite unreasonable. . . He had every intention of carrying on his campaign against the Gov^{nt}, in the camps that were then assembled, and from the Gov^{nt}s point of view they were bound to act—However, everyone, my staff included, jumped at conclusions, and I was in a most difficult position. Technically my Gov^{nt} were entirely in the right in their behavior to Dundonald. I therefore could not oppose their action, though I did what I could to modify the asperity of their procedure, whilst the accusations against them of political interference *on this occasion* were trivial, the question of such political interference was not one on which I considered the Governor General could publicly put himself in opposition to his Gov^{nt}. I said a great deal privately, and in an official memo to Council, but it was not a case in which I should have felt justified in appearing publicly to censure my Gov^{nt}—this is what no doubt many people hoped for. As long as a G. G. retains his Gov^{nt}, in my opinion he cannot appear as censuring them . . . In the present state of Imperial relations such action would have done a great deal of harm—Besides, though I know a G.G. can do much good by setting his face against political interference, in my opinion it rests with the people of Canada to what extent they will put up with it—Dundonald has bought a house here just outside our back gate . . . and I am afraid it looks very much as if he intended to take further part in things here. . . His action has, I consider, been most regrettable.

Now I must ask you to forgive the extraordinary length of this epistle . . . I only hope that putting any part I have played in it aside—the great interest of the subject may be my excuse—

I enclose you two cuttings from the Citizen (an extract from the Economist, and an editorial on it, which I have alluded to), and I also enclose copies of three speeches of mine, which if you have time to run through them may help to explain my ideas—

I do not know with whom the printing of these speeches originated—I have had nothing to do with it . . . I believe they have been printed at Gov^{nt} expense—and I have been sent copies.

In conclusion I will only say that we are in the midst of great Imperial changes—that one must ride with a light hand—but that all the same the juxtaposition of the U.S. to Canada renders an appreciation of the position of the Mother Country absolutely vital as regards the future of the Empire—

I said at the commencement of this letter I would give you a note as to certain particular events . . . but I will not do so . . . I hope I have said enough to explain them . . . but they are episodes as to which one might write pages . . .

The following points, however, I would like to mention as briefly as I can—

Our official tours . . . We have, I think, travelled over a great part of the Dominion—but our visit to the Yukon in 1890¹¹ . . . and my ride on horseback from Edmonton to Saskatoon about 400 miles through the valley of the Saskatchewan, from which I have just returned, have been, I think, of much public interest—The first, I believe from the knowledge I obtained helped to throw much light on abuses which existed there, and which have been largely remedied—whilst my recent ride has given me a knowledge of the country which is now being opened out—the magnificent future of which it is impossible to exaggerate. I saw it all in the brilliancy of 'the fall' tints, the prairie carpeted with pink rose leaf, hillsides brilliant with scarlet dogwood and golden poplar . . . the plains strewn with buffalo heads, and skeletons, and scored with the trails of the myriads that have vanished

¹¹This date should be 1900.

—and settlers pouring in by the thousand—the beginning of a new era . . whilst Winnipeg is in itself a fairy tale . . Ft. Garry in 1870 . . in '85 when I first knew it a city of 25,000 . . at the last census two years ago 75,000 . . and now they estimate the population at 95,000 . . with enormous buildings springing up on all sides, banks and commercial houses—it is marvellous—

The Institutions with which I have been connected to which I would like specially to refer are

1. The Canadian Patriotic Fund Association.

2. The Canadian Association for the Prevention of Consumption . . .

Lady Minto is giving me a note to endorse as to those which she herself has undertaken.

The Canadian Patriotic Fund was entirely my creation—I established the whole machinery and appointed and formed every committee myself—I do not know what would have happened without it . It is now incorporated by Act of Parliament . . I used to attend all meetings, but now it is in perfect order, & I only attend on special occasions—You will see in my First Report the origin and object of the Assocⁿ . . . There were no Gov^{nt} funds to meet the requirements—and this Assocⁿ has filled the place of Gov^{nt} assistance . . For some reason or other though I created the whole thing, the fact that I did so appears to have been forgotten . I suppose because it has become a recognized public institution—

The Prevention of Consumption Assocⁿ I also really created. An attempt was made to form the Assocⁿ, but there was misunderstanding and confusion, and I was asked to take it up, which I did . . arranging all committees, &c . . and at first attending meetings personally . . Now it works quite smoothly and is doing a great deal of good—so far as it is educational, with a view to explaining the causes, and remedies, and prevention of consumption—As time goes on we hope to be able to establish sanatoria as models, &c.

I am enclosing reports on these two associations in a separate envelope.

I shall also enclose in the same envelope Lady Minto's notes. I cannot say what a splendid work her cottage hospital scheme has proved, especially in remote districts . . and she deserves all the admiration anyone can bestow for the way she has carried it through . It is a splendid success.

I have marked this private, but gladly leave it entirely to your judgement if you think it worth showing to anyone—and of course if you think any public reference to any action of mine likely to produce any feeling of friction in high quarters here I know you will omit it . . . Again so many thanks for your letter to me, and unlimited apologies for the length of this, and am always,

Yrs very truly,
MINTO.

Sir W. L. decided today to go to the country. Consequently we must stay on till after the elections, & have now settled to sail on Nov. 18th:

M. Sep 29, 04.¹²

¹²This postscript is added at the top of p. 1 of the letter.

Arthur Dobbs and Joseph Robson: New Light on the Relationship between Two Early Critics of the Hudson's Bay Company

GLYNDWR WILLIAMS

THE MIDDLE YEARS of the eighteenth century were anxious ones for the Hudson's Bay Company. After the period of comparative stability and affluence which had followed the return to the Company in 1713 of its possessions in Hudson Bay, it faced dangers from the French in America and from its rivals in England. In the Bay the Company's position was threatened both by the penetration of French traders to the heads of the rivers down which the Indians brought furs to the Company posts on the coast, and by the possibility of open French aggression during the War of the Austrian Succession: in England its charter and very existence were assailed by powerful mercantile elements whose attack was directed by Arthur Dobbs, the most persistent of the Company's critics at this time.¹

After remaining in comfortable obscurity for many years, the Company found itself the focus of considerable attention, accused of holding vast privileges by an illegal charter, of failing to develop the territories it claimed, and of concealing the Northwest Passage. In his 1741 edition of *The British Empire in America* John Oldmixon was unable to relate anything about the Company's history since 1713 because, despite his "pressing Instance," he could obtain no information from the Company or from any other source;² but within the next eight years books on Hudson Bay were written by Dobbs, Ellis, and Drage, while Campbell in his popular revision of Harris's collection of voyages devoted considerable space to an examination of the Company's affairs.³ The culmination of this publicity was reached in 1749, when a Committee of the House of Commons was set up to consider the Company's position and right to its charter. After hearing the evidence of numerous witnesses and examining certain of the Com-

¹A recent biography by Desmond Clarke, *Arthur Dobbs Esquire* (London, 1957), describes the many-sided career of this Irish administrator, economist, writer, and colonial governor.

²John Oldmixon, *The British Empire in America* (2nd ed., London, 1741), I, 566-7.

³John Harris, *Navigantium atque Itinerantium Bibliotheca*, revised by John Campbell (London, 1744-8), II, 286-93, 434-51.

pany's papers, the Committee decided in favour of the Company. Arthur Dobbs had already announced his retirement from the struggle in favour of "some more happy Adventurer,"⁴ and although the Company was still alert to the possibility of interloping expeditions, the danger seemed past.

This was the position when, in 1752, a book was published in London entitled, *An Account of Six Years Residence in Hudson's-Bay, From 1733 to 1736, and 1744 to 1747. By Joseph Robson, Late Surveyor and Supervisor of the Buildings to the Hudson's-Bay Company.* The book was of importance as being the only one written in English up to that time by someone who had considerable experience of Hudson Bay—other authors had spent at most one winter there—and it was generally well received. The *Gentleman's Magazine* recommended it for the enlightenment of politicians,⁵ Malachy Postlethwayt in *The Universal Dictionary of Trade and Commerce* quoted its concluding pages in full,⁶ while the *Monthly Review*, after summarizing Robson's argument in "a matter of such great importance," concluded that "the author relates his facts with an air of honesty and seeming regard to truth; and we are credibly assured, that his account is as honest and just as it appears to be."⁷

However, historians, while recognising the importance of Robson's book, have not endorsed contemporary opinions as to its reliability.⁸ They have pointed out the close connection between the arguments of Robson and those of Dobbs, and that Robson appeared before the Parliamentary Committee in 1749 as a hostile witness to the Company. In spite of this no evidence has been forthcoming that Robson was, as Samuel Hearne later described him, "a tool in the hand of Mr. Dobbs,"⁹ no connection has been established between Robson and Dobbs, and the general belief is that Dobbs had given up interest in the affairs of the Hudson's Bay Company three years before the publication of Robson's book.¹⁰ The book itself is divided into two sections, a seventy-five-page account by Robson of life in Hudson Bay, interspersed with criticisms of the Company's policy, and a series of six appendixes of which by far the longest is the sixty-four-page Appendix 1. This contains a brief history of the Company, together with "Remarks upon the Papers and Evidence produced by that Company before the Committee of the Honourable House of Commons, in the Year 1749," and is a bitter attack upon the Company. Evidence has now come to light which

⁴*A Short Narrative and Justification of the Proceedings of the Committee appointed by the Adventurers, to prosecute the Discovery of the Passage . . .* (London, 1749), 13.

⁵*Gentleman's Magazine*, XXII (June, 1752), 290.

⁶*The Universal Dictionary of Trade and Commerce . . . translated from the French of Savary des Bruslons with large additions by M.P.* (London, 1751—), I, 961.

⁷*Monthly Review*, VII (July, 1752), 75-6.

⁸See Arthur S. Morton, *A History of the Canadian West to 1870-71* (London, 1939), 227-8; George Bryce, *The Remarkable History of the Hudson's Bay Company* (London, 1900), 75; J. F. Kenney, ed., *The Founding of Churchill* (London, 1932), 80, 197.

⁹Samuel Hearne, *A Journey from Prince of Wales's Fort in Hudson's Bay, to the Northern Ocean* (London, 1795), xxii.

¹⁰Dobbs himself furthered this impression. In an article on bees—his only known published work of this period—he wrote, in October 1750: "Since my View of doing Good, by making Discoveries of the Great World have been disappointed, upon my Retirement into this little Corner of it, amongst other rural Amusements I have been contemplating the inhabitants of the Little World; particularly that most useful and industrious Society of Bees." (*Philosophical Transactions 1749-50* (London, 1752), XLVI, 536). His biographer, however, has shown that at this time he was a busy member of the Ohio Committee, and still took an active part in the debates of the Irish Parliament. (Clarke, *Arthur Dobbs*, 91-4, 104).

indicates that this Appendix was not written by Robson, but by Dobbs, and that Dobbs also revised those sections written by Robson.

Among the Dobbs Papers in the Public Record Office of Northern Ireland is a document, in Dobbs' handwriting, which is a rough draft of the Appendix 1 of Robson's book.¹¹ In the published Appendix the errors in grammar and spelling of the manuscript have been corrected, there are occasional additions of detail, some parts of the draft have been transposed, and the style is more polished; but apart from these minor alterations the two are the same. This alone would justify a suspicion that Dobbs had a hand in the writing of the Appendix,¹² and that this was in fact the case is shown by a letter at the end of the manuscript draft, which runs as follows:

DR SR

I wrote to you about a fortnight ago by a sloop that I expected would have sailed from Carrickfergus with Clay for your Port, But our Weather has been so very Bad she could not get her loading of Clay from the Pits, and by her I sent you 3 Packets, one in which was the full part of Robsons Papers, in another the Revised draughts I had made of it to be forwarded to Campbell with the former I sent over to you, and in the 3rd the 3 draughts of the Petitions you desired me to send you—as I find the sloop has not yet sailed but will be ready in a Day or two, I have been hard at work to send you the Papers I Inclose to you with this in a 4th Packet, which if put into Mr Campbells hands with Robsons may be of some service and corroborate what Robson has wrote, and further expose the management of the Company. I have only had time to recast it into tolerable form without polishing it, but as I must go off next week to Dublin to attend our Parliament, I had not time to put the best Hand to it, and therefore must submit it to you as it is to put it into Campbells hands, in case you think it will be of use as the Materials I have Collected are true if the observations I have made are just and proper. I had lost for some time the Report of the Committee, but having found it by accident just after I had sent you the Last Packet with the draughts of the Petitions, I lost no time in taking the Companys Papers and management in pieces, as you will find by the Inclosd which I wish you may be able to Read as I have had so little Time to write and digest it. Let me know by Letter directed to me at the post office Dublin if you get all these Packets safe, and when you have time to peruse them whether you approve of them. I wish you success in all your Endeavours for the good of the Publick as well as for your private Interest, make my compliments to all Friends. I am in haste with great Esteem.¹³

The letter is unsigned and undated, and the manuscript is evidently a copy made by Dobbs of the original draft and letter which he had dated, signed, and sent to his unknown correspondent. That the writer was Dobbs there can be no doubt: the whole manuscript is in his distinctive handwriting, his home was at Castle Dobbs in Carrickfergus, and he was a member of the Irish Parliament. Several points emerge from a study of the letter. Dobbs had originally intended to send three packets to his correspondent, one of which contained Robson's draft which he, Dobbs, had revised and was sending in a separate packet. This

¹¹Dobbs Papers D.O.D. 162/62. The writer is grateful to Mr. B. Trainor of the Public Record Office of Northern Ireland for first drawing his attention to this document.

¹²The editors of the Kelsey journal, which was found among the Dobbs papers in 1926, noted the document and its resemblance to Robson's Appendix 1, but apparently did not see the letter, and so were unable to advance any definite opinion as to the authorship of the Appendix. (Arthur C. Doughty and Chester Martin, eds., *The Kelsey Papers* (Ottawa, 1929), x.)

¹³The letter bears every sign of being written "in haste." In places the handwriting is only just legible, and there is little punctuation. Punctuation has been added, but otherwise the wording and spelling is that of the original.

would doubtless be the account of Hudson Bay given in the first seventy-five pages of the book, although it is impossible to say whether it was on Dobbs' initiative that Robson first wrote it. The Report of the Committee found by Dobbs after he had sent the three packets was the *Report from the Committee Appointed to Inquire into the State and Condition of the Countries Adjoining to Hudson's Bay, and of the Trade carried on there*, published in 1749. This contained the evidence of witnesses before the Committee, and with it were published those papers produced by the Company in its defence. With the additional material sent to him by Robson, it seems as if Dobbs could not resist the temptation of using the time before the sloop sailed to take "the Companys Papers and management in pieces," and the result was the Appendix 1 of Robson's book.

It is impossible to name Dobbs' correspondent with any certainty. He might have been Samuel Smith, attorney to Dobbs in London during the period of the attack on the Company, and Secretary of the North West Committee, which played an important part in that campaign. A more confident guess can be made as to the identity of the Mr. Campbell mentioned in the letter. He was probably John Campbell, a noted writer of the day with wide interests and a considerable reputation, whose most ambitious work up to this time was his enlarged edition, already mentioned, of Harris's *Navigantium atque Itinerantium Bibliotheca*. In this work Campbell had devoted much space to the arguments of Dobbs, a "judicious Person," and expressed himself in complete sympathy with his aims. The document itself was obviously written between 1749 and 1752; sometime in 1751 is the most likely date, allowing a sufficient lapse of time for Dobbs to have lost his 1749 Report, but still leaving time enough for the work to be published in the spring of 1752.

There can be but little doubt that Dobbs deliberately intended his comments to be published under Robson's name, although it is possible that at the time of writing the draft he was thinking only in terms of having it published anonymously. There is no indication on the title-page or elsewhere that the book was the work of two persons; reviewers at the time accepted it as Robson's work; the other five appendixes, with their estimates of building costs at Churchill and soundings of rivers in Hudson Bay, were clearly written by Robson; most conclusive of all, both the manuscript and published versions of the Appendix contain references to Dobbs in the third person. His reasons for letting his work appear under another's name are not difficult to understand. To a certain extent Dobbs was a discredited authority. Two expeditions acting on his instructions had failed to find a Northwest Passage, and many of his earlier accusations against the Hudson's Bay Company had proved of little weight when the Company produced its witnesses and papers before the Parliamentary Committee. By this time few could regard Dobbs as being anything but a violently prejudiced observer, whereas Robson, on the other hand, could claim first-hand knowledge of Hudson Bay, and had held a position of some importance in the Company's service, being a member of the Council at Churchill in his last year there.¹⁴ An illustration of Dobbs' intention is perhaps to be found in Postlethwayt's *Universal Dictionary of Trade and Commerce*, where the editor, to supplement and confirm what Dobbs

¹⁴The Company records show Robson to have been something of a trouble maker while in Hudson Bay, and in 1747 he was finally sent home from Churchill with the factor's comment to the Committee that he and two others had "Declar'd themselves Your Honrs. Enemys." (HBC Archives, A 11/13 f. 102). The writer is grateful to the Governor and Committee of the Hudson's Bay Company for permission to use the HBC Archives at Beaver House, London.

had written about the Hudson's Bay Company, quoted the latest writer on the subject, Robson, but as the section he printed came from Appendix 1 he was in fact quoting Dobbs again!

Whether the writing of the joint work was part of a larger plan to renew the attack on the Company and lay open the trade of Hudson Bay seems doubtful, although at the time the book was published there was a move by several of the London merchants who had been associated with Dobbs, to obtain exclusive rights to the trade of Labrador. The Company regarded the project as a thinly disguised attempt to encroach upon its domains, and successfully appealed against the merchants' petition.¹⁵ At all events Dobbs himself was soon to have other responsibilities, for towards the end of 1752 he was informed of his forthcoming appointment as Governor of North Carolina. With this final withdrawal of its old antagonist the Company settled down to a period of security at home, which enabled it to face with more confidence the prolonged struggle with its rivals in North America which lay ahead.

¹⁵Details are to be found in P.R.O. (London), C.O. 5/6 ff. 71-91, and S. P. Domestic 44/323 ff. 41-9. Two drafts of a scheme for settling Labrador are among the Dobbs Papers (D.O.D. 162/53 and 162/54).

Pests, Meddlers, and Regicides

W. W. PIEPENBURG

IT WAS JAMES I's conclusion that the Puritans were "verie pestes in the Church and Common-weale," and that the common lawyers were pernicious meddlers in his sacred prerogative. The drift of their opinions seemed to James and his son, no less than to Elizabeth, to be "dangerous to a kingly rule," and the Protestation of Parliament in 1629 seemed, indeed, to suggest a shocking repudiation of the traditional relationships in English political life. But Puritans, legalists, and parliamentarians were not new phenomena in early Stuart England. No single Puritan divine in James' reign was so much a pest as Cartwright was in Elizabeth's reign. True, no common lawyer defied the Queen the way Coke defied James, but Attorney Morrice was meddlesome enough. Nor was Elizabeth unacquainted with subversive threats to her regal power; she had only to call to mind a name like Wentworth, or Throckmorton, or a Parliament like that of 1587, or any of several earlier ones, to appreciate how precarious the balance of politics really was during her own lifetime. That she avoided serious conflict is undoubtedly explained by her close adherence to policies so national that more elements in society always supported than opposed her.

James and Charles, in fewer years than the length of Elizabeth's reign, reversed the political balance. By their policies they split the governing classes and created an alliance of Puritans, legalists, and parliamentarians against the Crown and its allies. Not much more than a quarter-century after Elizabeth's death, the Commons, obstreperous in her reign, became uncontrollable. By 1629 the problems of English society had been relentlessly exposed, but no one then knew the fatal course events would take during the next generation. In the effort to explain the political origins of the revolution of the 1640's, the parliamentary history of the first three decades of the century has always been crucial. From Gardiner to Notestein to the followers of Namier, there has been no lack of interest in the seven Parliaments which sat between 1604 and 1629.

Nearly all students of parliamentary history must realize by this time that Wallace Notestein's thesis of "the winning of the initiative by the house of commons" has had to be adjusted, owing to the work of Sir John Neale on Elizabeth's Parliaments. Neale has shown that there was much more procedural development and much more evidence of parliamentary initiative during Elizabeth's reign, and far earlier in her reign, than Notestein or anyone else had ever expected. It is astonishing, therefore, that a book should lately appear in

which there is no recognition of this and other significant changes in emphasis.¹

Professor Mitchell has attempted to study the relation between "the emergence of a real opposition and the development of procedural forms" from the accession of James I to the dissolution of 1629. For each of the Parliaments he has tabulated the composition of the Commons, the continuity of membership, the influence of patronage, and the extent of procedural change and committee development. He has collected an enormous quantity of information, but he seems to have only the haziest notion of what to do with it. The only conclusions which bear on the stated object of the book appear to be that a "revolutionary party" did not emerge until the 1628-9 Parliament, that the committee method of doing business gradually developed after 1603, and that "the opposition" managed to play a decisive rôle by dominating the important committees. Of these, only the last makes a new contribution, and it could have been presented much more suitably as an article in an appropriate journal, in something less than 123 pages of text and 43 pages of closely packed notes.

The author apparently means by the phrase "revolutionary party" a group of men who "combined their efforts to achieve certain political ends." He never provides a better definition than that, but he uses a host of terms which obscure the issue—"puritan party," "patriot party," "concerted opposition," "opposition party," "the party," "the revolutionists," "popular party," "opposition group," "a real opposition," and "a definite opposition." About all this one can only say that everything is quite indefinite. In any case, who were "the revolutionists" in 1629? One would like to know their names, and also the evidence for calling them revolutionists. Sir John Eliot, perhaps? His three resolutions seem something less than conservative, to be sure, but Sir John spent his remaining years in the Tower composing political treatises devoted to the glories of an archaic ideal of monarchy. No, evidence is required to support Professor Mitchell's assumptions, and masses of statistics on committee meetings and reports do not help us very much.

The author is equally confused with respect to nearly every significant historical hypothesis which is in any way connected with his subject. Two examples need to be mentioned. Consider, after Neale, this statement: "It is not surprising that we find, beginning about 1592, a restiveness in the house and outbursts of daring individuals." Or, in view of the present state of socio-economic interpretations of the century prior to the civil war, this remark: "Was all this (crown versus Parliament, i.e.) a constitutional manifestation of the rise of the English middle class . . . ? It is incontestable." Nor does the author manage any more skilfully in matters of style. An entire paragraph on page 48 is written in the historical present tense. There are occasional sentences so unclear that they leave the reader entirely baffled. There are many sentences which betray inexpert control of the most elementary rules of usage and word order, and even the paragraph structure is frequently faulty. If there is anything incontestable about this volume it is that the author should never have published it in its present state.

The general direction of early Stuart parliamentary history has been appreciated for a long time, and we are now ready for the application of Namier's method to the separate Parliaments of the period. We could undoubtedly profit by accounts similar to Brunton and Pennington's volume on the Long Parliament. A recent work by Thomas Moir attempts to unravel the causes of the rupture between

¹Williams M. Mitchell, *The Rise of the Revolutionary Party in the English House of Commons, 1603-29* (New York: Columbia University Press [Toronto: Oxford University Press], 1957, pp. xviii, 210, \$4.25).

James and his Parliaments by analysing one of his "most abject failures."² Despite the author's apology for applying modern terms like "parties," "the opposition," and "the leaders of the opposition," his repeated use of these terms still causes occasional confusions. It must be said, however, that he uses them with the full awareness of their inappropriateness. Quite contrary to Professor Mitchell's discussion of the 1614 Parliament, Professor Moir clearly establishes that the opponents of the Crown's parliamentary programme were unorganized obstructionists, irresponsible and violent, and never bound together by a common aim. The opponents of the Crown in the Parliaments of the 1620's were united to some extent by the common threads of nationalism and puritanism, but the only issue in 1614 on which the obstructionists could temporarily unite was impositions.

The real reason for the added proceedings of the 1614 Parliament was not that the Crown lacked sufficient agents in the House, but that its agents were plainly incompetent. The latter point has long been known; the former completely reverses Gardiner's view. The elections clearly returned a stronger court element than in 1604, and this, incidentally, is the only way in which the 1614 Parliament differed significantly from earlier ones. As one would expect, the 1614 elections were most certainly not fought as a national contest between the court and its opponents, but on the local level over local issues and loyalties. The author skilfully discusses all the main proceedings of the Addled Parliament, but he should have made his account complete by telling us more about the monopoly discussions and at least something about the debates on the Merchant Adventurers and the Virginia Company. Despite these caveats, this is an admirable volume, and it is not the author's fault that only a very modest general conclusion can be drawn from the evidence—that the old Tudor constitutional relationships had broken down and that no solution to the problem had yet been envisaged by either the Crown or the parliamentary obstructionists.

Among the many criticisms of the Crown in the early Stuart Parliaments, those of the Puritans and the common lawyers became especially prominent in the Parliaments of the 1620's, when the Crown had already gone a long way in its policy of meddling with the lawyers and pestering the Puritans. Professor J. D. Eusden, struck by the many similarities in the outlooks of the two groups, has investigated the influence which puritanism and the common law had on each other during the first three decades of the seventeenth century.³ He found no direct influence of the kind he thought would be likely, but he did uncover an interesting "ideological parallelism" which makes a genuine contribution to our understanding of the history of the early Stuart period. In his discussion of the Puritan and common law positions, their thought, and the resistance of both groups to the Crown's policies, Eusden admirably summarizes a vast quantity of intellectual and political history which has long been well known. The novel part of his thesis is his careful delineation of the Puritan principle of the divine sovereignty of God and the common lawyers' principle of the fundamental law. These two ideas of the two groups led to similar conclusions with respect to the nature of sovereignty, the doctrine of the separate functions of governmental institutions, and the limitation of political authority. Given the political circum-

²Thomas L. Moir, *The Addled Parliament of 1614* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press [Toronto: Oxford University Press], pp. x, 212, \$4.50).

³John Dykstra Eusden, *Puritans, Lawyers, and Politics: In Early Seventeenth Century England* (Yale Studies in Religious Education, vol. 23; New Haven: Yale University Press [Toronto: Burns & MacEachern], 1958, pp. xii, 240, \$5.75).

stances of the early seventeenth century, the influence of the two groups, while parallel, joined in the early Stuart Parliaments, and played a prominent part in the events leading up to the revolution.

Professor Eusden raises many difficult problems of interpretation in his account of divine sovereignty and fundamental law. He is neither sure of himself nor is he entirely clear in his discussion of the rôle of natural law in Puritan thought. There is sometimes a too easy acceptance of the Puritan and common law position at the expense of the royal point of view. James admittedly tended to exercise legislative power in the form of proclamations, but even in his political theory he recognized the validity of national custom—and that, in England, meant the validity of parliamentary statute. In his discussion of the later influence of the early seventeenth century idea of distributive authority, Professor Eusden is very weak, and he makes some fatal errors. It is not possible these days to write that George III "showed a penchant for Stuart ways," or that "the Whigs . . . maintained supremacy in the government from 1688 until their downfall in 1790." The works of Namier, Walcott, and many others are now required reading for anyone who hopes to cope with post-revolutionary history. In any event, the case for the future influence of the idea of distributive authority should not overlook the history of the Interregnum and the American colonies.

That the Puritan conception of the universe was increasingly receptive to rationalist ideas can effectively be illustrated by the career of Lord Brooke (1608-43), ardent Puritan and parliamentarian, energetic soldier, close associate of Lord Saye in colonial ventures and English politics, philosopher, and pamphleteer. Professor R. E. L. Strider II, who has just published the first account of the life and thought of Lord Brooke,⁴ abundantly establishes the transitional influences which determined the intellectual and political outlook of the educated Puritan during the early Stuart era. In *The Nature of Truth*, written during the Second Bishops' War, Lord Brooke's method is largely Aristotelian-scholastic. At the same time, his "ineffable vision of the unity of all things" is founded solidly in the mystical tradition, his notion of truth is derived almost entirely from platonism, and he is extremely Baconian in his receptiveness to science.

This confident rationalism in his make-up strongly affected his view of the ecclesiastical controversies which pervaded English intellectual life from Cartwright's time to the revolution. Lord Brooke stated his own views in *A Discourse Opening the Nature of Episcopacy*, which he wrote between the first and second sessions of the Long Parliament. His arguments against divine right episcopacy were not in the least original, but in his consideration of the Church's power to enforce conformity to "things indifferent," his rationalism led him to a theory of toleration three years before Milton published the *Areopagitica*. Lord Brooke, had he lived, would with Milton have repudiated any religious system which claimed the right to violate the individual conscience. Professor Strider thinks that Lord Brooke would have become a separatist, but it seems more likely to this reviewer that he would have become an Independent. The comprehensive and tolerant Cromwellian establishment would almost certainly have satisfied all the requirements of the *Discourse*. It is difficult to conceive that Lord Brooke, so insistent on the hierarchical social structure of the age, would have countenanced the social and political implications of post-war separatism.

⁴Robert E. L. Strider II, *Robert Greville, Lord Brooke* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press [Toronto: S. J. Reginald Saunders and Company Limited], 1958, pp. xiv, 252, \$6.50).

This last point emphasizes the main flaw in Professor Strider's account. As literary and intellectual history it is excellent, but the author's command of political history is often faulty. He seems to be unaware of the crucial differences between classical independency and separatism. Furthermore, the orthodox gospel according to Gardiner is no longer entirely acceptable in our heterodox mid-twentieth century world, and Mr. Strider's allusions to the history of the Long Parliament are sometimes nothing short of ludicrous. Sometimes he doesn't even follow the gospel: for example, "When Parliament reconvened on October 20 (1641) the devotees of episcopacy had become royalists"; or, "By this time [presumably, judging by the text, November 1641] the imminence of civil war was generally recognized. . . ." Sir Edward Hyde certainly didn't think so. It may be argued that these points do not weaken the fundamental validity of the account. Nonetheless, all the relevant material must be mastered by anyone who undertakes to write the biography of an active politician and Puritan intellectual like Lord Brooke. He reached his maturity in 1629, and he died in the skirmish at St. Chad's Cathedral, Lichfield, in 1643, on St. Chad's day, as fate would have it. A vast quantity of history was enacted between those two dates, and frankly, this reader would like to have seen Lord Brooke's career and ideas more securely woven into the dramatic sequence of that history.

Lord Brooke, had he lived a normal life span, would have witnessed the disintegration of the old ideal of national religious unity, and in its place, the appearance of an ineradicable heterodoxy, which was destined to become a fundamental characteristic of English-speaking civilization forever after. The critical stages of this transformation occurred during and immediately following the civil war. In victory the parliamentarian host split into its component parts, the Presbyterians and the Independents, and in due course the parliamentary Independents, allied with the sects and the army, seized control of the revolution. It is a well-known story as Gardiner originally told it. Then, in 1938, J. H. Hexter⁵ pointed out that many so-called Independent members of the Long Parliament were also elders in the newly established Presbyterian Church of England. In view of this evidence, Hexter suggested that the old Presbyterian and Independent party labels were useless as religious descriptions, and that the distinction between the two parties must have lain in politics rather than in religion. Now, twenty years later, an Australian scholar has applied himself to Professor Hexter's enigma, and he has done so with brilliant results.⁶

Mr. Yule demonstrates that the names, Presbyterian and Independent, did indicate religious positions, especially after the adoption of the Solemn League and Covenant in 1643. From that point on, both in Parliament and in the Westminster Assembly, and eventually in the army too, the question of a national religious settlement was a critical issue. The Presbyterian Church which Parliament established in 1646 was prevented by the parliamentary Independents and the Erastians from developing a genuine coercive jurisdiction, and therefore, all those Independents who valued a national Calvinist church based on the parish system were able in good conscience temporarily to become elders in that imperfectly organized Presbyterian Church. What divided the Presbyterian and Independent parties, therefore, was the question of toleration. The Presbyterian

⁵J. H. Hexter, "The Problem of the Presbyterian Independents," *American Historical Review*, XLIV (Oct., 1938), 29-49.

⁶George Yule, *The Independents in the English Civil War* (London: Cambridge University Press and Melbourne University Press [Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited], 1958, pp. viii, 156, \$4.00).

party insisted that the church must be able, like the old episcopal Church, to enforce conformity. The Independent party steadfastly held that the Church could not under Christ's law force the conscience of any one of God's (Calvinist) people. In their battle to win the civil war and to prevent the establishment of coercive presbyterianism, the Independents in Parliament and Assembly allied with the army, and temporarily with the sects, which were more radical in religion than the Independents themselves were, with the republicans, more radical in politics, and even with the Levellers, more radical in social questions.

Thus, the Independents were a coalition of factions who had in common only the ideal of religious toleration, and who, on every other issue, were deeply divided, and could never have any common social aims. When the Independent army grandees established their military dictatorship and committed regicide it did not take very long for the coalition to disintegrate. Conservative independence triumphed under the protection of the army grandees, and Cromwell, the largest-minded Independent of them all, proceeded to erect a national church so comprehensive and so tolerant of wild and ungodly (non-Calvinist) people—Quakers, Socinians, and even worse, Jews—that even the Independent divines began to wonder whether so wide a toleration might not lead straight to anarchy. There was the rub. The descendants of James I's "verie pestes" had turned the state upside down in a whole series of revolutions. Puritanism was inevitably political. When at last the commotions had been momentarily stayed, the pests themselves were as ready as any Stuart had ever been to prevent the emergence of yet another and more dangerous breed of pests, and heaven knows what "damnable heresies" in church and commonweal.

The Russian Revolution

ROBERT H. MCNEAL

WRITING IN 1949, Isaiah Berlin complained of the comparative paucity of historical study on the Russian Revolution thirty years after the event.¹ Could the same complaint be justly lodged following the passage of a fourth decade since 1917? The answer seems to be negative if one regards the publication of fairly specialized works on the revolution. Ranging in quality from the outstanding studies of Carr, Kennan, Pipes, and Schapiro through a large body of solid and helpful works, the contributions of scholars of the West have justified Berlin's assertion in 1949 that much could be done in the relatively neglected field of the Russian Revolution, even in the absence of Soviet co-operation.

It is true, however, that no really valuable general history of the revolution has appeared in this time, which probably explains the popular success of Alan Moorehead's *The Russian Revolution*.² Where the qualified historians have failed to satisfy a natural popular demand, it is not surprising that some writer would step in to attempt to meet the need. Moorehead's book has three merits. It is the work of a lively writer of popular history, though his admirable qualities in this line were much better displayed in his *Gallipoli*, where he dealt with a subject which he had mastered. Secondly, it is principally an acceptable synthesis of about

¹Isaiah Berlin, "Three Who Made a Revolution: A Review Essay," *American Historical Review*, LV (Oct., 1949), 86.

²Alan Moorehead, *The Russian Revolution* (New York: Harper & Brothers [Toronto: The Musson Book Company Ltd.], 1958, pp. xvi, 301, illus., \$5.00).

ten of the well-known works concerning the revolution. This debt is cheerfully acknowledged by the author (in his "Notes on Sources," pp. 287-9), and the list of works from which Moorehead's book is largely constructed is commendable for its quality, though hardly for its scope. Thirdly, Moorehead is to be congratulated on having resisted what seems to have been an attempt by the editors of *Life*, who commissioned the book, to have him write a general reinterpretation of the revolution, founded on new evidence concerning Lenin's relations with the Germans. This evidence, we are told in the Preface, was gathered at great pains from the records of the German Foreign Ministry by a research team under the leadership of Stephen T. Possony. According to Moorehead's Preface, this research has established "that the Germans played an important role in bringing Lenin and the Bolsheviks to power, and that it has made clear that the revolution was not quite the uncorrupted epic the Communists have made it out to be." In short, one might have expected a revival of anti-Bolshevik polemics on the model of the *Sisson Papers*,³ although this model has already been most convincingly dissected by George Kennan.⁴

Fortunately, Moorehead is too judicious to fulfil this expectation. Although he inserts one chapter on "The German Revolutionary Net," based on Possony's research, this merely expands previous knowledge of German efforts at subversion without indicating any degree of Bolshevik commitment to the Germans. Moorehead treats this interesting episode with appropriate dispassion and does not, despite his Preface, attempt to show that German activity was particularly important in determining the outcome of the struggle in 1917. *Life's* editors evidently hoped to see Lenin's acceptance of German aid exposed as an example of Bolshevik immorality, though evidence of even massive German assistance, if it existed, would only prove that Lenin was as supple as Benjamin Franklin, who obtained Bourbon aid for a republican revolution. In any case, there is only one available bit of evidence that the Bolsheviks received German funds after Lenin's return to Russia. This document, a message from Kühlmann in December, 1917, was published before the appearance of Moorehead's book, although this is not acknowledged.⁵ Since this document is isolated and imprecise, one may agree with Moorehead that "it still seems doubtful whether we are ever going to get the full truth of the matter."

In short, one wishes that Possony had written his own essay if he had anything more definite to reveal concerning German-Bolshevik relations in the period of the revolution. The new evidence gathered by Possony and used by Moorehead has its interesting points, but does not revise any major conclusions held by most historians.

Nor are such revisions going to be in order, on the showing of Z. A. B. Zeman, who has searched the German archives and edited a selection of documents from them.⁶ This collection, concisely introduced and explained in editorial comment, validates the narrative of Moorehead on German policy before April, 1917, and is substantially fuller on later 1917 and 1918. The documents do not indicate German manipulation of the Bolsheviks, but they do reaffirm the generalization

³*The German-Bolshevik Conspiracy* (Washington, 1918).

⁴George Kennan, "The Sisson Documents," *Journal of Modern History*, XXVIII (June, 1956), 130-54.

⁵George Katkov, "German Foreign Office Documents on Financial Support to the Bolsheviks in 1917," *International Affairs*, XXXII (April, 1956), 181-90.

⁶Z. A. B. Zeman, ed., *Germany and the Revolution in Russia 1915-1918: Documents from the Archives of the German Foreign Ministry* (London and Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1958, pp. xxiv, 157, \$3.75).

that all large administrations, especially conspiratorial ones, are bumbling. A solid interpretation of the documents edited by Zeman would now be very welcome.

If any proof is needed that German manipulation was of little importance in bringing the Bolsheviks to power, it is supplied by Oliver H. Radkey's ample and masterly study, *The Agrarian Foes of Bolshevism*.⁷ The work of many years and standing beside anything yet written on the Russian revolution, Radkey's history of the Socialist Revolutionary Party before the October Revolution treats a genuinely central problem with meticulous attention to detail, judicious critical analysis, and an admirably vivid prose style. The first quarter of this work describes the evolution of populist and Socialist Revolutionary beliefs, the organizational development of the party to 1914, and the disastrous impact of the war upon the party. In the remaining three-quarters of his study Radkey traces the tortured path of the S.R.'s from the February Revolution to the eve of October. With a sure hand, he illuminates the grievous flaws in the S.R.'s conduct in the crucial months that began with February: the blindness to the dangers of continued war, the failure to fulfil their primary aim of agrarian reform, the defaulted promise of national self-determination, the willingness to accept ministerial responsibility without insisting on commensurate power, and the enforcement of party discipline only when it was least useful. Chernov, the main intellectual leader of the party, is demonstrated as having the largest share of responsibility for this syllabus of errors, though the main principles of Radkey's devastating critique of Chernov are much the same as those expounded by the victim in his own history, *The Great Russian Revolution*.

Radkey's scholarship is outstanding, but this reader questions his assumptions on one point of interpretation. Again and again Radkey castigates the intellectual leaders of the S.R. Party, implying that their intellectualism is much to blame for their failure. Almost as often, he berates the "intellectuals" among historians who, he holds, have squandered time on the study of populist and S.R. theories. Though he sometimes shows a streak of petulance in his asides on intellectuals in general, Radkey displays unusual talent in his own concise treatment of theoretical matters. But what of the implication that intellectuals, or Russian intellectuals, are naturally incompetent? Were not the Bolshevik leaders intellectuals, grown from much the same social roots as the S.R. chieftains? Why, then, did the Bolshevik, and even the Menshevik, branch of this genealogical tree prove to be far more capable than the S.R. branch? Radkey holds that "sentiment and temperament transcend theory as determining factors in human behavior," and that S.R. sentiment and temperament are of crucial importance in understanding the failure of this party. Naturally, he denies the importance of the "intellectual vapors" of the populist and S.R. tradition. To this reader, Radkey has not established a viable distinction between the two categories, one assertedly real and vital, the other mythical and unimportant. His study itself often seems to show that the history of the theories of the S.R.'s is by no means irrelevant to the central issues. Fortunately, Radkey of the prickly anti-intellectual spirit does not interfere very much with Radkey the accomplished historian.

By working on the records of a defeated, exiled Russian party, Radkey has utilized one rich source of material that the Soviets cannot control. Another such source, which has been tapped with success several times, is material concerning

⁷Oliver H. Radkey, *The Agrarian Foes of Bolshevism: Promise and Default of the Russian Socialist Revolutionaries February to October 1917* (Studies of the Russian Institute, Columbia University; New York: Columbia University Press [Toronto: Oxford University Press], 1958, pp. xvi, 521, \$9 00).

non-Bolshevik governments of the borderlands of Russia. C. Jay Smith, Jr., has used this approach in his *Finland and the Russian Revolution*.⁸ His study is certainly a helpful contribution to the history of the Russian borderlands in the era of the revolution. It is especially valuable in its analysis of military operations in 1918-19, the period of the creation and defence of an independent Finland. What is regrettable, especially in a subject that is not likely to be done twice, is the author's failure to make full use of available archives. Although published extracts from various state archives were used, Smith evidently missed the opportunity to examine the open resources of the German Foreign Ministry and the archives of the Department of State of the United States. Several of the documents published by Zeman, too late for Smith's study, indicate the desirability of such research.

In summary, the condition of research on the Russian Revolution is sound today, and achievements in recent years call for a new, first-class synthesis. The greatest need, however, remains the problem of entry to the Soviet archives. They are still waiting there, not effectively used by the harassed Soviet historians of the revolution, and, until independent scholars can get into them, major aspects of the revolution cannot be treated adequately.

⁸C. Jay Smith, Jr., *Finland and the Russian Revolution, 1917-1922* (Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia Press, 1958, pp. xii, 251, \$4.50).

European

Consciousness and Society: The Reorientation of European Social Thought, 1890-1930. By H. STUART HUGHES. New York: Alfred A. Knopf [Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Limited]. 1958. Pp. xii, 434, xvi. \$6.75.

THIS IS AN ESSAY in intellectual history and should, therefore, be welcome to all historians. For whatever diminishes the role of the intellect, of purposive choice, diminishes the role of the historian. The historian's concern is with change, which must be "at least partially the result of conscious mental activity." ("Somewhere, at some time, someone must have decided to do something.") But the historian—whose subject is precisely the actions and thoughts of men—has had to reckon with two great schools (the Marxist and the Freudian) which have both, though in different ways, insisted that "the basic characteristic of human experience was the limited nature of its freedom." And in North America, at least, the historian has worked in a world in which social science has seemed actually to take pleasure in confining the operation of conscious choice within ever narrower limits.

Fortunately, as Raymond Aron pointed out, the historian has no need either to deny, or to be frightened of, "the basic" in human conduct. Whatever may be the case with "the economic sub-structure" or "irrational drives," the subject-matter of history can never be merely repetitive. "Vast impersonal forces," writes Dr. Hughes, "are simply abstractions—the sum of an infinite number of small but strictly personal decisions. In a statistical sense, the outcome of a large number of choices may be predictable, but in a metaphysical and ethical sense most of us are convinced that each individual choice is free. Our vocabulary and categories of thought imply this conviction."

It is this unashamed attachment to the final values of the Enlightenment which has determined, it would seem, both the period which Dr. Hughes has chosen to study and the title which he has given to the outcome of his inquiry. The crucial

question which faced his "generation of the 1890's" was "the problem of consciousness." Whereas rationalists and empiricists alike had once agreed "on an identity of view between actor and observer in the social process, and on assuming this common attitude to be that postulated by scientific investigation or utilitarian ethics," it was now realised that the study of society was "a vastly more complicated matter than one of merely fitting observed data into a structure of human thought that was presumed to be universal." Between the data to be observed and the formulation of the results of observation, lay the stage of the observer's reflection on his own awareness of the data. "The result was an enormous heightening of intellectual self-consciousness—a wholesale re-examination of the presuppositions of social thought itself."

It is in this attempt to "comprehend the newly recognized disparity between external reality and the internal appreciation of that reality" that Dr. Hughes finds the common denominator between the thinkers whom he has chosen to study. At first sight, the group seems heterogeneous enough.¹ But this is *not* a string of intellectual biographies, nor is Dr. Hughes dealing with the *technical* development of social science. If he concerns himself with individuals, it is because "charting the vicissitudes of an idea through time is a dangerous pastime" and because the best way to anchor the historical imagination in reality is to keep close to specific cases: and if he seems preoccupied with sociology, it is not with the somewhat methodology-ridden and fragmented subject which goes by that name in our academic curricula, but with general social thought as it was understood by a Weber; with ideas which transcend the limits of any one intellectual discipline and which are relevant for other fields of knowledge. Indeed, Dr. Hughes sees it as a characteristic of his representatives of the 1890's that they were "transition figures between philosophy and science," raising questions which were "universal and highly speculative," and giving answers which represented only what "had proved amenable to quasi-scientific treatment."

Two central problems occupy his attention: in the foreground, theories of man's purpose, the definition of human nature; and, behind these, the epistemological question of how the human mind can ever arrive at knowledge of human society at all. On the first of these problems, Dr. Hughes is still, in the phrase which he uses of Weber, "for the Enlightenment malgré tout." But he is for the Enlightenment on its "open, undogmatic" side; accepting the nineteenth century correction of the epistemology and psychology of the Enlightenment, to the extent that these ever were really "shallow and mechanistic," but holding to the characteristic ethical postulates of the Enlightenment, and, chief among them, "the insistence, where possible, on rational solutions and humane behaviour." In one sense, the whole subject of his book is that the thinkers whom he studies were engaged in a critique of the Enlightenment, but he is emphatic that their hostility was directed "not so much against the eighteenth-century tradition in its original guise as against its late nineteenth reincarnation—in travestied form—as the cult of positivism": and he distinguishes between "those who in scoffing at the Enlightenment were consciously attacking the humane values of the West, and those who, by probing more deeply the problem of human motivation and the structure of society, sought to re-state that tradition in terms that would carry conviction to a sceptical generation." It is clear (cf. pp. 314-15, 334-5, and

¹Freud, Weber, and Croce; Durkheim, Pareto, Bergson, Georges Sorel, and Jung; Mosca, Michels, Meinecke, Troeltsch, and Peguy; Dilthey, Gramsci, Spengler, Wittgarten, and Mannheim; Benda, and Alain; Gide, Alain-Fournier, Proust, Pirandello, Hesse, and Mann.

427-31), that his own sympathy, an informed sympathy, is with the former group.

It is Dr. Hughes' discussion of the second problem, that of epistemology, which will be the most directly useful to historians, though they would be foolish to neglect any part of this book. From several starting points, and in connection with divers of his subjects, the author approaches the central core of our professional problem: how to assert the "scientific" character of history writing without following the positivists into an unsophisticated application of the language and methods of natural science to the course of human affairs; and how, on the other hand, to assert the fruitful place of "understanding," of "intuition," of *verstehen*, in history, without lapsing into the pre-scientific subordination of history to metaphysics. This, and its corollary, the relativist implications of any attempt to walk the tight-rope between positivism and neo-idealism, is the central question in Dr. Hughes' treatment of Dilthey and Croce and Troeltsch and Meinecke; but it is also implicit, for example, in his treatment of Durkheim and of Weber.

As we should expect of a former pupil of Professor Brinton, what Dr. Hughes has to say on this fundamental question of the nature of historical knowledge is both fair-minded and judicious; and probably the only questionable assumption which is made in this book, without the author being explicitly aware of it, is the assumption that the values of intellectual freedom are the values of democracy. Canadian historians may wish to read this thoughtful work alongside Raymond Aron's "The Opium of the Intellectuals" and H. L. Marrou's "De la Connaissance Historique."

H. N. FIELDHOUSE

McGill University

Culture and Society: 1780-1950. By RAYMOND WILLIAMS. London: Chatto & Windus [Toronto: Clarke, Irwin & Company Limited]. 1958. Pp. xx, 363. \$6.75.

THE TITLE OF THIS book is somewhat misleading. It suggests a study of the amount and quality of culture—however defined—that has existed in different classes of English society from 1780 to the present. Mr. Williams' object is much narrower and perhaps more important. He begins by showing that the idea of culture was born of conservative criticism of the industrial-democratic society which emerged in the late eighteenth century. From the recognition of what the new society lacked came the first emphasis on "cultural" values, which in turn led to the idea of a special class of "intellectuals" dedicated to the preservation and dissemination of these values. In this way the concept of culture became "a court of appeal" and a mark of prestige, tending to separate the cultured few from the uncultured masses. These developments are traced from Burke and Coleridge through Mill and Arnold to our own times. The book is larger and more complex than that, but this summary serves to indicate the area of inquiry.

It should be said at once that Mr. Williams has not written what would normally be called a work of historical scholarship. In his Introduction he states that his "overall purpose . . . is to describe and analyse" the phenomenon of culture "with all its complexity of idea and reference" and "to give an account of its historical formation." This promises a detached and systematic approach. But

a page later he says, "I expect the book to be controversial." The fact is that Mr. Williams is writing to support a cause, and at bottom a political cause. His book is a tract for the times, set in historical perspective. It is a plea for the working-class idea of a collective society against the *bourgeois* idea of an individualist society, and for the dissemination of the culture of the past, so far as this is possible, to the entire people.

I am not condemning this. On the contrary, it is because Mr. Williams is dealing with a problem of enormous importance, dealing with it out of his own, living background in a working-class family, and speaking with fine control—quietly, lucidly, flexibly (not ignoring the difficulties)—and with deep conviction, that he has written a challenging book. If it is not a "work of scholarship," it is something just as good.

Still, he must accept the price he has to pay. No intellectual historian will think that he analyses the idea of culture in all its complexity or gives an adequate account of its historical formulation. The word is used in a number of ways: to mean, for example, "the harmonious development of all sides of human nature," or a knowledge of "the best that has been thought and said in the world" about the life of man, or "the cultivation of the intellect as an end." But Mr. Williams does not show whether these meanings are interrelated parts of a whole, or discrete developments from a common source. If Mill adopts the first and Newman the third, are they talking about the same thing or two different things?

Furthermore, are all these meanings to be accounted for historically by a broad reference to industrial-democratic society? In nineteenth century England the religious problem, including the problem of doubt and disbelief, was so central that it was bound to affect a large idea like culture and its ramifications, but this is never said, let alone explored. As a result the brief reference to Arnold's use of culture as a substitute for religion carries no significance. In the description of Carlyle's important lecture, "The Hero as Man of Letters," the chief role of the writer, to teach "all men that a God is still present in their life" and to give the "Divine Idea" a new dialect suitable for the times, is never mentioned, though it serves admirably to link the formation of an intellectual class with the religious crisis. Or again, the idea of harmonious development of the whole man meant different things to different writers, and it had roots not only in the industrial and democratic revolutions, but also in the romantic revolt from rationalism, the widespread influence of Goethe, and the reaction against evangelical over-emphasis on the conscience. If it is said that Mr. Williams has a right to narrow his focus to the single relationship between political-economic forces and the idea of culture, the answer is that not to recognize the factors just mentioned, not even in his Introduction, produces inevitable distortion of what he gives us, and is, for the uninitiated, highly misleading.

One thing is certain. Mr. Williams has opened up an original and important line of inquiry, and now someone else must carry it out, for the nineteenth century at any rate, with far greater thoroughness. (He seems to me on firmer ground in the last chapters on Lawrence, Eliot, and other modern figures.) It is now clear, thanks to this book, that the various meanings of culture, their inter-relations and their complex connections with German literature, romanticism, religious doubt, and even with different aspects of both industrialism and democracy, need full investigation and analysis.

WALTER E. HOUGHTON

Wellesley College

The Idea of Colonialism. Edited by ROBERT STRAUSS-HUPÉ and HARRY W. HAZARD. University of Pennsylvania, The Foreign Policy Research Institute, no. 5. New York: Frederick A. Praeger Inc. [Toronto: Burns & MacEachern]. 1958. Pp. viii, 496. \$6.25.

THERE IS A LOT of annoying repetition in this volume—I suppose that it can't be helped in a production in which seventeen authors consider so protean a subject. There nevertheless remains a sizeable residue of fact and argument that attempts to do justice to what one contributor calls "the most serious issue confronting the free nations of the West."

The subject matter of *The Idea of Colonialism* comprises both the remnants of the nineteenth century European empires in Asia and Africa and the "new" colonialism of Soviet Russia. It is useful, though perhaps redundant by now, to be reminded that the imperialism of Tsarist Russia was no less a reality than that of contemporary England and France, and that this expansionism did not cease abruptly in 1917. But, to this reviewer at least, it seems to obfuscate the real policy problems that the free nations of the West face when one includes under the one heading "colonialism" both the issues raised by the tide of nationalism in Asia and Africa and those presented by Soviet domination of Eastern Europe (not to speak of those emanating from the colonial status of non-Russian nationalities within the Soviet Union which several of the contributors allege). The implicit conclusion that one is supposed to draw from this linkage is that we must be as much concerned with "liberating" the Russian satellites and ethnic groups within Soviet Russia from colonialism as we are with securing the independence of the remaining colonies of the Western powers and supporting the economic growth and democratic development of the newly independent nations. This is perhaps a necessary stock-in-trade for the *émigré* writer, and we cannot but be sympathetic with his personal plight. But it is poor politics and utter unreality.

For the plain fact is that, unless we desire to initiate an atomic holocaust—and we do not, thank God—there is little we can do about Eastern Europe. But a policy towards colonial and recently-colonial Asia and Africa that faces up to the realities of nationalism and economic need in that part of the world can perhaps still succeed in ensuring the genuine and continued neutralization of the so-called "neutralist" nations. That would be no small victory for democracy and decency, considering the present direction of events and despite the ignorant who, lacking all confidence, rant, "if they ain't for us they're agin' us."

Several of the contributions to *The Idea of Colonialism* show the difficult position in which the United States finds itself: traditionally anti-colonial, but at the same time closely allied in NATO with the principal colonial powers of Western Europe. In this connection, Julius W. Pratt's "Anticolonialism in United States Policy" is a convenient survey. Arthur P. Whitaker's "Anticolonialism in Latin America" is illuminating for the current image of the United States in that area and in particular for his analysis of "political," "economic," and "military" colonialism. Genevieve Linebarger's "The Aftermath of Japanese Colonialism in Southeast Asia" demonstrates the conscious policy of Japan in the last days of the war to promote anti-Western parties and governments in the territories which it had overrun. Also of particular interest is Irene W. Meister's appraisal of the 1955 Afro-Asian conference at Bandung, though I suspect that she exaggerates the potential consequences of that meeting. Norman D. Palmer's "Indian Attitudes

Toward Colonialism" leaves something to be desired, and assumes perhaps too easily that Indian attitudes are in large part a reflection of the "colonial mind" and the "slave mentality" that are still prevalent among Asians today. Unfortunately, except for a short chapter on Algeria, there is little attention given to the problems of the Middle East. William Y. Elliott's "Colonialism: Freedom and Responsibility" is a judicious summing-up, but his proposal for a new conception of property rights in basic world resources probably will not find many takers.

All of these contributions, and a number of others I have no space to mention, cast some light on the problems of colonialism, but we are still a long way from devising an adequate policy which would satisfy both the United States and its allies and the uncommitted parts of the world.

A. FEUERWERKER

Harvard University

Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge. By H. C. PORTER. Cambridge: At the University Press [Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited]. 1958. Pp. xii, 462. \$10.50.

IN TUDOR ENGLAND academic life and ecclesiastical life were intimately intertwined. The men who rose to positions of influence in the one sphere usually achieved corresponding importance in the other. The issues which convulsed the microcosm of the university affected in comparable degree the macrocosm of the nation. It is from this fact that Dr. Porter's book derives its importance. Only an incurably superficial critic would minimize its value on the grounds that it is concerned with a segment of academic history at a relatively distant date.

Dr. Porter deals with the most important religious issues of a period when religious issues were supremely important in English life. By placing them in the context of university life, he is able to subject them to microscopic inspection. Cambridge was a restricted stage; on it the rôle played by movements of thought can be minutely studied, and we can see how often these were affected, at least in their expression, by personal antipathies. The stage may have been small, but a succession of notable figures crossed it. From Fisher and Cranmer to Launcelot Andrewes and John Overall, the great leaders of English religious life appear. It is surprising how many of them were Cambridge men—or is it?

The intensity of academic debate verged sometimes on the petty, sometimes on the venomous. But the issues themselves were seldom trivial. Dr. Porter has a keen eye for the significance of human situations; he also has great skill in elucidating the complexities of theological thought. He shows us the way in which the major Reformation convictions found expression in an English idiom. The party in the Church of England which favoured further reform was Calvinist in outlook and sympathy. In explaining the position adopted by its leaders, Dr. Porter gives us one of the best available accounts of their doctrines of grace and reprobation, election and predestination. William Perkins, perhaps the most notable of the Cambridge Puritans, is made their spokesman, and provides the opportunity for a reasoned statement of their convictions. Tudor Puritanism, though it had its headquarters in the University of Cambridge, spread far beyond it, to the parishes where these men earnestly preached the Word and faithfully shepherded their people, and even to the frontiers of the American wilderness. But Calvinism did not pass unchallenged. In Barrett and Baro, Andrewes and Overall a more

moderate view came to expression. There were quarrels within the university between the partisans of the two positions; in the next century these disputes would be transferred to a wider setting, and there played out with a violence which convulsed the nation.

This is a very valuable book as well as an exceptionally interesting one. It has the piquancy which belongs to the small world of university dons, and the expansiveness which belongs to the great world of religious belief and commitment. Dr. Porter has at his command an erudition which is extensive but never oppressive. The gap which his work has filled was so obvious that it is amazing that a subject of such importance had been neglected for so long. But this is a book which it has been worth waiting for: the treatment of the subject could scarcely be improved.

GERALD R. CRAGG

Andover Newton Theological School

The Political Thought of Thomas Aquinas. By THOMAS GILBY. Chicago: University of Chicago Press [Toronto: University of Toronto Press]. 1958. Pp. xxvi, 357. \$5.00.

THE AUTHOR OF THIS book on the political thought of Thomas Aquinas clearly states its contents in the last paragraph of his Introduction: "The following study is divided into two parts. The first is introductory, a selection of events, institutions, sentiments and ideas which he [Thomas Aquinas] had to reckon with, arranged under four chapter-headings, on theology, law, social history and philosophy. What he made of these sometimes conflicting elements is discussed in the four corresponding chapters of the second part, and capitulated in the concluding summary."

The two parts of the book are of unequal length, less than a third being devoted to the influences at work on the mind of Thomas Aquinas, the rest being a discussion and interpretation of the political thought of Aquinas. This is, of course, as it should be: the first part sets the stage for the main problems to be discussed and provides a framework for that discussion in the second part.

The volume is well produced. The format fits the hand; the paper is strong and good; the binding is solid; the type is large and clear, well leaded and readable; the running heads at the top of the pages are varied and informative; the footnotes are at the bottom of the pages. There is a table of contents listing the chapter headings, augmented by a synoptic table providing a breakdown of the several topics dealt with in each chapter. A list of abbreviations used in the notes and references is supplied. The notes contain frequent references to the appropriate literature, thus providing a sufficient Bibliography. There is also a good Index.

The author writes with a flowing pen and moves with ease among the scores of ideas that crowd in upon his mind apropos of almost any topic he happens to be dealing with at the moment. Some readers may find many of them distracting and dubiously relevant but, on the whole, they are stimulating and suggestive. The author appears to have read, or at least dipped into, a vast array of books written by experts in the various fields of learning involved in his discussions and he quotes or cites them aptly and sometimes with telling effect.

The analysis of Thomas Aquinas's political thought, as it emerges through the host of allusions, illustrations, comparisons, and contrasts with which the writer has enveloped it appears to this reviewer to be adequate for the non-specialist, though far from complete in its details. The expert would probably find fault with certain insufficiently qualified statements which the author permits himself (no doubt, because to push them further would lead too far afield and greatly increase the bulk of the volume and, incidentally, the cost of publishing it).

In a word, this is not a book by a specialist for specialists but a genial, entertaining, rather diffuse but, withal, intelligent study of Aquinas's political thought after the fashion of other books which the author has published on logic (*Barbara Celarent*) and on the theory of knowledge (*Phoenix and the Turtle*). The serious reader who is not already quite familiar with the political philosophy of Thomas Aquinas will profit by the reading of this reliable statement of his thought.

GERALD B. PHELAN

The Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies
Toronto

The European Powers and the German Question, 1848-71: With Special Reference to England and Russia. By W. E. Mosse. Cambridge: At the University Press [Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited]. 1958. Pp. x, 410. \$10.00.

IN THIS THOROUGH-GOING example of meticulous scholarship Dr. Mosse of the University of Glasgow set to work "to re-examine the reaction of the powers to the German national movement and to show the considerations—often wholly unconnected with the affairs of Germany—which helped to determine their conduct." By so doing he has dispelled some of the trailing clouds of glory with which German historians have surrounded Bismarck. Although the author quite properly concedes that the Prussian "played his hand with great skill," he demonstrates to this reviewer's satisfaction that "it was a good one in the first place." What provided Bismarck with such good cards was the fact that Britain and Russia (to whom he devotes special attention), for different reasons and with different conceptions of the form a consolidated Germany should take, unitary and liberal in the one instance, dualist and conservative in the other, gave Prussia unexpected opportunities of which Bismarck took full advantage.

As Gorchakov plaintively remarked in 1866 when his country was criticized for its pro-Prussian policy, "What else can we do? Nobody can rely on France or England; Austria is weak and not well-disposed towards us. If we break with Prussia, we stand alone." The British justifiable distrust of Louis Napoleon in the decade following the Crimean War put an end to the Anglo-French alliance while the inept handling of the Schleswig-Holstein and Polish questions by Palmerston and Russell produced "a profound distaste for unnecessary interference in the affairs of the Continent." So long as British interests were not perceptibly injured by European developments, British leaders would stand aside as they did in 1866 and 1870. Thus, when the Crown Princess of Prussia, at her husband's request, consulted her mother about the advisability of the Hohenzollern candidature for the Spanish throne, Clarendon advised Queen Victoria that, although the arrangement would be adversely received in France, "it would not be expedient for your Majesty to give any advice upon a matter in which no British interest is directly concerned, and which can be only decided according

to the feelings and interests of the Family." In a footnote the author makes the scathing comment that "Clarendon's almost incomprehensive negligence had thus not a little to do with the outbreak of the France-Prussian war."

It was time for historians to examine this period in European history through other than German eyes. Dr. Mosse has clearly destroyed in German historiography what he describes in an interesting Appendix as "an extreme instance of the Whig interpretation of history." His book is thoroughly documented with the footnotes, *mirabile dictu*, at the bottom of the page on which they appear. It makes satisfactory, if not easy, reading.

F. H. SOWARD

The University of British Columbia

Bureaucracy, Aristocracy and Autocracy: The Prussian Experience, 1660-1815.

By HANS ROSENBERG. Harvard Historical Monographs, XXXIV. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press [Toronto: S. J. Reginald Saunders and Company Limited]. 1958. Pp. xiv, 247. \$6.50.

THIS SMALL BUT very compact volume is neither another account of the rise of Prussia nor a detailed administrative history. Rather, it is a bold and penetrating interpretation, based on the best secondary material available. The primary purpose of the author is to trace the history of Prussian bureaucracy: to evaluate its function within the framework of an absolute monarchy and to examine its social structure, particularly its relation to the aristocracy. Professor Rosenberg has thus touched upon the vital question confronting all students of absolutism: how real was the power of an absolute monarch? This question has been competently answered by Roland Mousnier's *La Vénalité des offices sous Henri IV et Louis XIII*. On the other hand the connection between bureaucracy and aristocracy, that salience of Prussianism, has been examined in L. W. Muncy's *The Junker in the Prussian Administration under William II, 1888-1914*.

Professor Rosenberg has not only combined the themes of Mousnier and Muncy, but, by taking a sweeping view, he has been able to unravel their development over a long period and to relate the events in Prussia to those in other states. He has shown how the Prussian rulers, in their attempts to free themselves from noble control, established a bureaucracy of their own. However, the instrument they created soon merged with the aristocracy. By establishing an *esprit de corps*, the bureaucracy, first in association with the nobles, and later, after the reforms of 1806-12, independently, actually curbed the power of the monarch.

While Professor Rosenberg demonstrates masterly craftsmanship in developing his main themes, there are a few peripheral points with which this reviewer takes issue. One would doubt whether the abstract theory of the state was entirely absent in Europe until the end of the eighteenth century (p. 14); or whether the Prussian rulers stifled the economic developments in their state by an excess of bureaucratic restrictions (p. 49). Moreover, could one consider Bismarck, who in his youth resigned in disgust from the Prussian civil service, as "a select bureaucrat" (p. 25)? As a whole, the subject-matter and sweep of this book will make it indispensable for any student of German history or the old régime.

I. N. LAMBI

The University of Toronto

History and Historians

Culture and History: Prolegomena to the Comparative Study of Civilizations.

By PHILIP BAGBY. London and Toronto: Longmans, Green & Company. 1958. Pp. x, 244. \$6.00.

Theory and History: An Interpretation of Social and Economic Evolution. By

LUDWIG VON MISES. New Haven: Yale University Press [Toronto: Burns & MacEachern]. 1957. Pp. x, 384. \$7.50.

HISTORY IS NOT YET established as a natural science, but this is not for want of the most strenuous efforts on the part of self-styled philosophers of history. Dr. Bagby, the latest of the breed, acknowledges the failures of his predecessors and, while claiming no more than that his approach to history "involves a sympathy with things as they are rather than as they ought to be," proposes to make history "intelligible" and "not only accurate but scientific." Quite reasonably he points out that the question: is a science of history possible?—can only be answered by trying to create such a science. And he claims to possess a key, or rather two keys, to the problem, not possessed by any of his predecessors: an exact terminology with which to formulate precise historical questions, and the scientific method of cultural anthropology.

Dr. Bagby has not found the answer. The definition of his terminology, which takes up the largest part of his book, does not achieve the scientific precision that he would like, but he gathers his numerous cultures and his nine civilizations (which look remarkably like Spengler's cultures), together and sets up a model of comparative study in the form of a forced equation of the Greco-Roman and Western civilizations.

But have we not been through all this before? Is this not a microcosm, complete with quotations from general history texts, of Dr. Toynbee's masterpiece, already condemned by Dr. Bagby as "too vague, inaccurate and prophetic to be taken seriously by historians?" Dr. Bagby stands revealed as an historicist—albeit of a new type—the cultural anthropological historicist, from whom we will probably be hearing more shortly.

This is a pity, as anyone who values the individual must agree, for historicists like Dr. Bagby, in their passion for sociological holism are necessarily impelled to discredit or suppress those individual characteristics which mar the symmetry of their system. And it is not the least of their disservices to social thought that they inspire such replies as *Theory and History*. Professor von Mises' hypothesis is unexceptionable: that human action is purposeful and that means, which are wholly distinct from ends, which embody value judgements, are to be judged only by their results. From this point of what he calls "methodological dualism" he launches an attack on positivism and historicism which is effective as long as it keeps to philosophic concepts, and though Professor Popper has done it all before, Professor von Mises expresses himself with great clarity and (need it be said) great force.

His passionate hatred of all forms of collectivism has led him into some remarkable lapses of logic, taste, and historical accuracy. What is the reader to make of the argument that because men prefer wealth to poverty, therefore other preferences which cut across this hypothesis must be ignored; or of the naïve simplicity of the proposition that the eighteenth century brought the light of rationalism to a world sunk in theological darkness. But the author's principal purpose is to elaborate that revival, already begun in *Human Action* and

Socialism, of the classical economic thesis that men are rationally motivated only by enlightened egotism and any tampering with the operation of the market economy, which alone allows freedom of choice and which alone harmonizes men's interests, is a negation of human freedom. Certainly no classical economist, except perhaps Quesnay, would have shared the unquestioning faith in the universal beneficence of the market economy. But then, like most revivalists, Professor von Mises outdoes the original. And this too is a pity, because individualism in the social sciences is already far too closely identified with anachronisms, and needs the sort of clear, intelligent, moderate defence which Professor von Mises, at his best, can give.

JOHN M. NORRIS

The University of British Columbia

The Poverty of Historicism. By KARL R. POPPER. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul [Toronto: British Book Service (Canada) Limited]. 1957. Pp. xiv, 166. \$3.75.

THE AIM OF THIS book is to discredit what its author regards as an improper use of historical enquiry in the systematic study of society. By "historicism" Professor Popper means "an approach to the social sciences which assumes that *historical prediction* is their principal aim, and which assumes that this aim is attainable by discovering the 'rhythms' or the 'pattern', the 'laws' or the 'trends', that underlie the evolution of history." Since the foregoing explanation is provided at the beginning of the book (p. 3), it would be captious to object that this is not what has commonly been meant by the term. Nor would it really undermine Popper's central argument to complain that the methodological villainy of such alleged historicists as Comte and Mill, Marx and Mannheim, can scarcely be regarded as established by the scattered quotations included in this book. For although *The Poverty of Historicism* (first published as a series of articles in *Economica* in 1945-55) is intended to provide a theoretical background for the author's chapter-and-verse "exposure" of a number of social theorists in *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, we are asked to judge it as an independent discussion of an "ism." And although, like the later work, it has an ultimate political purpose (it is dedicated to those "who fell victims to the fascist and communist belief in Inexorable Laws of Historical Destiny"), its immediate aim is simply to show the "inherent and irreparable weakness" of a certain methodology.

The book begins with a distinction between naturalistic and anti-naturalistic tendencies in historicism, the arguments for each being set out in Parts I and II, reserving for Parts III and IV the author's criticism of the doctrines stated—a plan which yields at points to Popper's impatience for the fray. Perhaps more reprehensible, since it tends to obscure the main argument, is his indulgence in extended discussions of "utopianism," "essentialism," "activism," "holism," "intuitionism"—doctrines which he admits to be merely associated with, and not a part of, historicism proper. The main weight of his attack is to be found in a simple, but important, distinction drawn between "laws" and "trends," the first being universal in form, the second not. It is Popper's contention that prediction of the future course of history based upon the pattern of the past almost always involves an illegitimate extrapolation of trends (misleadingly called "laws"). The "prophecy" arrived at by such a procedure, he maintains, bears no resem-

blance to "prediction" in accordance with scientific method—by which he means the method of the physical sciences (about which a number of illuminating observations are made). It is one of Popper's chief claims that historicist arguments against the employment of this method in the social studies are ill-founded.

To the present reviewer, Professor Popper's case against historicist methods appears convincing enough. What is more questionable is his assumption that to discredit historicism is, at the same time, to show the propriety of a "piecemeal social technology" modelled on the natural sciences. Popper's own admission, in a Preface, that historical developments cannot be predicted "to the extent to which they may be influenced by the growth of our knowledge" would at any rate seem to raise serious difficulties for the construction of social theories analogous to physical ones. Yet although one may regret that Popper leaves the poverty of "piecemeal social technology" virtually unexamined, the book does contain much that will interest those concerned about the proper relationship between history and sociology. The republication of this work, slightly amended, is therefore to be welcomed.

WILLIAM DRAY

The University of Toronto

Detachment and the Writing of History: Essays and Letters of Carl L. Becker.

Edited by PHIL L. SNYDER. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press [Toronto: Thomas Allen Limited]. 1958. Pp. xvi, 240. \$3.75.

Carl Becker's Heavenly City Revisited. Edited by RAYMOND O. ROCKWOOD. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press [Toronto: Thomas Allen Limited]. 1958. Pp. xxxii, 227. \$4.75.

IT WAS A HAPPY IDEA to print or reprint these essays and letters of Carl Becker's. Unpublished or scattered over thirty years in very different sorts of periodicals, they could not be of much service to anyone but research students. And Becker did not write for research students. The leisurely style, the irony and disparagement of self and of many other things, the slightly weary attitude that appeared so early ("Was Mr. Becker never young?" Edward Fox asks in the second of these volumes, p. 188), the grace and charm—these were for the cultivated general reader who once read the *Atlantic Monthly* before its old clientele was scattered forever by Harold Ross's *New Yorker*, Scott Fitzgerald, and the intense post-Marxian, Freudian sophistications of the *Partisan Review*. The literary blitz of the Jazz Age rather left Becker behind, apparently writing away as if nothing had happened, invoking the cosy securities of Blackhawk County and the light of the kerosene lamp falling across the pages of *Anna Karenina* when, as a small boy, he had sat rocking his way into the world of literature. If any demonstration were needed that a man's ideas are formed well before his fortieth year, Mr. Snyder's excellent selection would provide it. Which is not at all to say that Becker repeated himself monotonously, ceasing to have anything to say. But the ideas, the conceptions were there long before the Storrs Lectures of 1931 which became *The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth Century Philosophers*. As Robert Palmer says in the volume of critiques of this best-known work, Becker suffered from "an advanced case of historical relativism" (p. 126). The beginnings of it were evident before the First World War. The war itself deepened the conviction. In a way, Becker was a kind of casualty of that war, suffering above all and registering for the rest of his life the outraged idealism it produced in the

United States. The urbanity, the wit, the hint of world-weariness—were these not really a blind behind which he nursed the ideals no one seemed to want in the America of his middle years? Was he not really dropping a pose—a personal and literary pose—when in the last days of his life, with Germany on the rampage, he publicly affirmed the liberalism he had never quite despaired of? What we have in *Detachment and the Writing of History* is a collection of informal but important writings from the years between the wars, for the most part, representing public and private thoughts in the usual deceptively artless form. Writings on academic life and the life of the young, on writing, reading, and learning—but not teaching, for he knew that history, at least, could not be taught. And though professors either know all about this or are destined never to know, students and other people, who may not be so blessed or so condemned, will find something here to make them think, and even smile.

The essays edited by Mr. Rockwood make up a valuable full-scale assessment of a minor work of historical art. Henry Guerlac and Peter Gay in particular do a skilful job of demonstrating the short-comings of Becker's knowledge, assumptions and methods. Mr. Guerlac simply shows that Becker knew very little about science in the eighteenth century. Mr. Gay tracks down the verbal tricks Becker played upon the living to such good, and ultimately misleading, effect. The fault, some of Becker's former students (for example, Louis Gottshalk, Geoffrey Bruun, Leo Gershoy, Gussie Gaskill) are quick to point out, lay less with the master than with disciples and plagiarists who read more into *The Heavenly City* than its author intended. Whether this is special pleading, or whether the critics can be accused of breaking a butterfly on the wheel, for the most part the debate is carried on in gentlemanly fashion. The blows from the critics are in all conscience devastating enough, but they are not low. Only Ralph Bowen seems to have missed the point a little (to his own disadvantage, not Becker's), in letting his irritation carry him to the curious conclusion that "Carl Becker's real quarrel with the Philosophes arose out of his disappointment at finding that they were not actually such cynics as he had been brought up to believe" (pp. 153-4). But he too has other, more likely and pertinent observations to make. The critics here are perfectly right in stressing the too uncritical and general acceptance of Becker's eighteenth century in North America. The defenders are not less justified in pointing out that his principal purpose was to stimulate discussion. For surely any thesis must ultimately do damage to the vanished reality of the past. Historians are not likely on that account to abandon the fascinating and not wholly ephemeral work of seeking an interpretation which best fits their own accumulation and arrangement of the available traces. Moreover, it is not often that so long-lived and enchanting a success as Becker's is achieved. Just the same, of course, one may imagine the shade of Becker calling forth from wherever it is, "*touché!*"

JOHN C. CAIRNS

The University of Toronto

The Political Uses of History: A Study of Historians in the French Restoration.
By STANLEY MELLON. Stanford: Stanford University Press. 1958. Pp. x, 226.
\$5.00.

THE USE AND ABUSE of history in political and religious polemics has itself a long history; the Old Testament is full of it. Most of the modern use of historical arguments dates from three great currents in the history of thought: the humanist

movement of the Renaissance, the writings that came out of the struggles of seventeenth century England, and the great romantic movement of the eighteenth century. No wonder Voltaire remarked that "anything can be proved by history."

The political uses of history during the Third Republic in France were ably set forth by Paul Farmer in his *France Reviews its Revolutionary Origins* (New York, 1944). Now, Dr. Mellon has made a somewhat similar but much more penetrating study of the period of the Bourbon Restoration in France (1814-30). He shows, first, the enormous productivity of the Restoration in historical writing; in the year 1825 alone about forty million pages of history were printed, ten million more than all forms of *belles-lettres*. At the same time, in the periodical press, and in the Chambers "every political issue was given historical dimensions."

The Liberals began by rehabilitating the French Revolution, at least, down through 1791, and from this, they moved to a defence of the Charter of 1814. Later on, the Liberals used the issues of ultramontanism and of the Jesuits to split the conservative coalition of "the throne and the altar," that is, of monarchy, aristocracy, and clergy (of what, in the days of the Dreyfus case, came to be called "the union of the sword and the holy water sprinkler"). The whole of the past was foraged by the Liberals and by the Conservatives to prove or disprove one political argument after another. Joseph de Maistre in 1819 complained that the Liberals "foraged history in order to discover facts which occurred a thousand years ago and which have become more foreign to us than the Trojan War" (part 2), but the Conservatives were as guilty of this as the Liberals.

Dr. Mellon follows all the historical analogies and arguments used on both sides, and his last two chapters go far to prove an old contention of this reviewer, that it was the religious, rather than the political policies, of the Restoration government—especially after 1822—that brought on the July Revolution of 1830. The author is sometimes careless as a bibliographer; for example (p. 16n), he mentions a series of works with no indication of the place and date of publication. His style is clear and readable, though marred by an over-use of split infinitives and colloquialisms, as when he writes (p. 93), "the failure to properly sell the Charter to the new France." Neither the main title nor the subtitle give an exact idea of the nature of the monograph. From the book one gets neither a clear picture of the historiography of the Bourbon Restoration, as presented, for example, in C. Jullian, ed., *Historiens français du XIX siècle* (Paris, n.d.); nor does one leave the book with as well defined a conception of the ideological conflicts of the time as may be found in Bertier de Sauvigny's *La Restauration* (Paris, 1955). The study is definitely a reworking of a doctoral dissertation, of use to those who already know well the history of the Bourbon Restoration. It is based on both the printed books, newspapers, periodicals, and parliamentary reports of the period, and the large number of secondary histories and studies of the Bourbon Restoration. The monograph is a thorough piece of careful and patient research.

FREDERICK B. ARTZ

Oberlin College

Historical Pessimism in the French Enlightenment. By HENRY VYVERBERG. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, [Toronto: S. J. Reginald Saunders and Company Limited]. 1958. Pp. viii, 256. \$7.25.

CONCEIVED IN PART as "an antidote" to the enthusiastic progressivist views in such works as J. B. Bury's *Idea of Progress* and Jules Delaville's *Essai sur*

L'histoire de l'idée de progrès jusqu'à la fin du XVIII^e siècle this study represents the kind of dialectic or adjustment that is now a commonplace of historical investigation. Each extreme or monistic view of history evokes its counterpart or "antidote." This book also indicates a willingness in the spiritually shaken mid-twentieth century to study other aspects of our cultural background than those which have presumably pointed to an ever improving present. It might even be taken as an example of an age of doubt and uncertainty in search of its past.

However that may be, this is one case where a Ph.D. dissertation has contributed notably to a better balanced picture of a supposedly well-known historical period. The evidence that there existed a widespread pessimistic, sceptical and doubting side to the Enlightenment is convincingly demonstrated, and is shown to be present in greater and lesser writers alike. Historians will see with particular interest that the emphasis is placed heavily upon historical studies as being those that chiefly raised the doubts in eighteenth century minds, though empirical studies generally, organic philosophies, and Christian views of the imperfection of human nature have their part. With the author's conclusion that the pessimistic side was neglected by contemporaries and by later generations because it did not provide a basis for action comparable to that of optimism and the idea of progress we can but agree. Thus, by dragging out of the dark of neglect a disregarded aspect of the Age of Enlightenment, Mr. Vyverberg has helped to balance the historical ledger, and has shown anew that the real historical past is always more complex, many-sided and *moiré* than is commonly believed. He has also demonstrated clearly the capacity of people, historians included, to overlook and neglect this fact.

It is a pity that so able a study should still smell so strongly of dissertational impedimenta—the card-file is everywhere present. This, and its accompaniment, a rather pedantic style, are the chief defects of an otherwise excellent work. The selective Bibliography at the end of the book will be a great help to students in the field.

RICHARD M. SAUNDERS

The University of Toronto

North American

Canadians in the Making: A Social History of Canada. By ARTHUR R. M. LOWER.
Toronto: Longmans, Green & Company. 1958. Pp. xxviii, 475. \$7.50.

SOCIAL HISTORY, more than any other form of history, requires the selection of representative or revealing illustrations from a monstrous clutter of facts. Every society is a complex aggregation of groups which enjoy varying degrees of autonomy and believe in myths that may be complementary or contradictory. No two inhabitants would give identical descriptions of their own village; much less would two Torontonians completely agree on the character of contemporary Toronto. The chances of agreement on the characteristics of Canadian society spread over the centuries and over millions of square miles are slim indeed. And yet the village, the city, and the regions of Canada do have distinctive identities. The social historian must discern that identity, describe it and illustrate it. He must create a forest out of trunks and branches.

Professor Lower, in his Preface, admits his difficulties and does not claim that his thesis of social development from colony to province to nation can be

rigorously applied. Fortunately, he was not deterred by the difficulties. The result is a perceptive and stimulating description of Canadian societies. The variety of illustrations reflects the author's long and varied interest in Canadian history and, more important, his curiosity and his vitality. Every chapter includes anecdotes which were new to this reviewer and which would have seemed inconsequential but for the author's ability to give them significance. Religious ritualism, school readers, sports, parties, architecture, and immigration statistics are all used effectively to illustrate the character of Canadian society.

This is not a standard textbook, sheltered from controversy by sterile objectivity. Professor Lower not only describes; he also responds. For example, he has an unmistakable affection for the architecture of Kingston. As a result he leaves the reader with an impression of a city with dignity and restraint which no impersonal description could achieve. The society of New France has been so often described that a brief review of the community under Talon and Laval might have been dull—but Professor Lower is never dull. He is intrigued by the effect of Roman Catholicism on the character of the *ancien régime*, and so he gives a sympathetic and not unsuccessful explanation of what is for Protestants the paradox of fervent piety combined with gaiety. He can evoke an image of a city or a region in an apt phrase as when he describes Vancouver as “a modern metropolis on the edge of the bush” (p. 360). Sometimes the delight in epigrams or paradoxes leads to exaggeration, and the reader is startled by the comment that one result of the Orange Order in Ontario has been separate schools (p. 216), or that the Irish practically ruled Ontario for the last half of the nineteenth century (p. 195). The striking phrases and neat epigrams contribute to a staccato style which distracts the reader from the continuity of the text, but the distractions are delightful and stimulating.

In the last two chapters Professor Lower gives his personal reactions to modern Canadian society. This section of the book has attracted the most attention but it is the least satisfactory, as social history. The author has an affection for a more simple, rural society and is appalled by the ruthless destructiveness of modern industrial progress. Instead of describing and analysing the changes he becomes what the dust-cover describes as “an angry old man of letters” and fulminates against the modern deities.

It will be unfortunate if this book is judged only on the basis of the last two chapters. Professor Lower reacts personally to Canadian society in all ages, but he does not feel the same urge to denounce the past. The result is a vivid interpretation of Canadian society in different eras which is personal, impressionistic, and revealing.

H. BLAIR NEATBY

Laurier House
Ottawa

La Présence anglaise et les Canadiens: Etudes sur l'histoire et la pensée des deux Canadas. By MICHEL BRUNET. Montréal: Beauchemin. 1958. Pp. 292. \$3.50.

THIS VOLUME, which is a collection of Professor Brunet's articles and addresses over the past few years, constitutes a very interesting and readable presentation of the interpretation of French-Canadian history now being expounded by the nationalist school of historians at the University of Montreal. Two of the essays are outstanding pieces of historical analysis.

In *La Conquête anglaise et la déchéance de la bourgeoisie canadienne* he draws attention to the great blow suffered by the French-Canadian community when they lost their own upper *bourgeoisie* of *entrepreneurs* and merchants who had conducted the fur trade and established close financial relations with similar interests in old France. After the Conquest they were pushed out by the English-speaking merchants who established commercial and financial ties with London; and henceforth the French-Canadian *bourgeoisie* consisted only of small-scale, mostly retail, traders and of little local lawyers and other professionals. The French-Canadian community ceased to be masters of their own economic destinies. They lacked what every progressive nation going through the great technological and commercial developments of the nineteenth century enjoyed, a directing upper *bourgeoisie* of their own.

This mutilation of their society ("social decapitation" as he calls it) led to another result which Professor Brunet treats in his next chapter, *Trois Dominantes de la pensée canadienne-française: l'agriculturisme, l'anti-étatisme et le messianisme*. Before 1763 it was by no means the belief of the St. Lawrence community that agriculture was their natural destiny, offering them a purer Christian life than materialist commerce and industry. But as the nineteenth century went on the myth of "*agriculturisme*" became a Utopia which was preached to the French Canadians by churchmen, poets, publicists, and politicians, most of whom themselves lived in cities. The natural development of the province which a strong *bourgeoisie* would have brought about was distorted, and the energies of the people were side-tracked along mistaken lines. Professor Brunet has a good time making gentle fun of all these prophets of "*agriculturisme*," including those two heroes, Mgrs Bourget and Laflèche. Also, since the power of the state until 1867 was in effect in the hands of the English Canadians, an extreme anti-statism dominated French-Canadian thinking, preventing the French Canadians from taking proper advantage of the constructive possibilities of state action. Thus they failed to avail themselves fully of their great achievement in 1867, the capturing of control of the provincial Quebec state.

This thesis is brilliantly argued in this chapter and others. Is an outsider wrong in thinking that he detects certain overtones of anti-clericalism in these pages, as when the author demands reforms in the educational system and asks whether the clerical control of higher education is any longer justified? An outsider also seems to detect on some pages a certain yearning towards state socialism; the author looks back nostalgically to the "royal socialism" of Talon. This strain in his writing is not quite fully consistent with the "*bourgeoisisme*" which he preaches elsewhere. It is clear, however, that in the advanced countries of the Western world "*bourgeoisisme*" generally produces sooner or later both anti-clericalism and "*ouvrierisme*," the latter being an "ism" which Professor Brunet at present detests.

The later chapters in the book have rather too much rhetoric mixed in with their historical analysis. Professor Brunet is always asking for the fullest assistance of the social sciences in the public policy of the province, but his own sociological concepts are much too simplified. He plays with the antithesis of majority community (English Canadian) versus minority community (French Canadian) as if majority and minority were simple solid entities not capable of further analysis. He never asks himself whether "*bourgeoisisme*" may become a Utopia also; and he shuts his eyes to the fact that technological developments under *bourgeois* leadership inevitably involve in our modern world a closer and closer interdependence with other communities. You might think from reading his pages

that French Quebec, because of its peculiar trauma of 1763, is the only community finding itself unable to control its own economic destinies; whereas this is a fate with which all communities, strong or weak, majoritarian or minoritarian, with or without a *bourgeoisie* of their own, have had increasingly to struggle in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

All of which leads one to doubt whether Professor Brunet is justified in rejecting so summarily the tentative approaches of some English-Canadian intellectuals (whom he admits to be noble souls) towards a bicultural Canada. If his Quebec community develops economically as he hopes, he and his friends are going to find it more and more difficult to maintain their minoritarian isolationism.

FRANK H. UNDERHILL

Laurier House
Ottawa

Evolving Canadian Federalism. By A. R. M. LOWER, F. R. SCOTT, *et al.* Commonwealth-Studies Center Publications, 9. Durham, N.C. Duke University Press. [Toronto: Burns & MacEachern]. 1958. Pp. xviii, 187. \$4.25.

THIS BOOK CONSISTS of five papers. The first four, on the subject proper, were presented to the 1957 Summer Research Group at Duke. The fifth, comparing the Canadian and West Indian federations, was read at a Summer Institute on that subject at Mount Allison University. All of the book is brilliantly written, and nearly all of it is very good. The best paper is Professor Corry's "Constitutional Trends and Federalism"; but Professor Scott's "French-Canada and Canadian Federalism," Professor Soward's "External Affairs and Canadian Federalism," and Professor Brady's "Canada and the West Indies," all run it a close second.

Professor Lower's "Theories of Canadian Federalism—Yesterday and Today" is, as might be expected, lively, original, witty, and penetrating. Unfortunately it is marred by many mistakes of fact. For example, disallowance was last used sixteen years ago, not "some twenty" (p. 14). Perhaps "no lawyer would admit" that the B.N.A. Act "does contain a Bill of Rights" (p. 17), but several Supreme Court judges have come very close to it. The "whole scheme of the division of powers" is not in sections 91 and 92 (pp. 20-1). The 1865 Debates are the "Confederation," not "Constitutional" debates (p. 25). The 1892 case cited on pages 30 and 31 is the "*Liquidators* of the Maritime Bank," and so on. The summary of the reasons for decision in the Radio case (p. 31), "Radio comes under telegraphs," is too summary by half. Privy Council appeals were abolished not in 1947 (p. 40) but in 1949 (p. 29). Titles were abolished in Canada not by the Prime Minister "simply inform[ing] the House of Commons that in future the Crown would be advised not to grant" them (p. 49), but by the House of Commons Address of 1919. To say that the Supreme Court decision in the Padlock Act case "brought up the hardest and least manageable fact in Canadian life—the presence of two races differing fundamentally in language, religion, ideas and historic tradition" (p. 43) ignores the fact that one of the two French-Canadian judges in that case came down decisively with the majority.

Much more serious is Professor Lower's treatment of judicial decisions on the B.N.A. Act from 1930 to 1949: "From 1930" the Judicial Committee "began to strengthen the central power, and by 1947 . . . had restored something like life to many of the original vital clauses of the B.N.A. Act" (p. 40, see also p. 29).

This is, frankly, ridiculous; and Professor Lower contrives to give it plausibility only by minimizing one important decision, forgetting several others, and stating one completely upside down. He gaily dismisses the highly anti-Dominion decision in the Labour Conventions case as "an eddy in the nationalistic stream" (p. 32). He does not mention the Employment and Social Insurance case, the Natural Products Marketing case, the railway hotels case, the margarine case, or the Japanese-Canadians case, which last restored the "emergency doctrine" on "peace, order and good government," which the Committee had repudiated the year before. Worst of all, he describes that very decision, the Canada (not "Canadian") Temperance Federation case, as having "cut down peace, order and good government to an 'emergency power' once more" (p. 32, see also p. 38), when in fact it did exactly the opposite.

In spite of these blemishes, however, the book will be invaluable, not only to readers outside of Canada, for whom, presumably, it is primarily meant, but also to Canadians.

EUGENE FORSEY

Canadian Labour Congress
Ottawa

Royal Fort Frontenac. Texts selected and translated from the French by RICHARD A. PRESTON. Edited with Introduction and Notes by LÉOPOLD LAMONTAGNE. Ontario Series, II. Toronto: The Champlain Society for the Government of Ontario; University of Toronto Press. 1958. Pp. xxx, 503, illus. \$5.00.

IL N'Y AURAIT que de la justice à noter d'abord l'activité de la Champlain Society. La liste de ses "publications" ne cesse de s'allonger. L'ensemble constitue une contribution de premier ordre à l'œuvre d'érudition sans laquelle l'histoire ne peut pas accomplir de progrès solides. C'est là une réalisation qu'on a plaisir à souligner au moment où, depuis plusieurs années, les services officiels d'archives ont considérablement ralenti le rythme auquel ils avaient habitué les historiens à recevoir des "rapports" comportant des inventaires et des recueils de documents.

Le présent volume est le premier d'une compilation en deux tomes relative à l'histoire de Kingston. Il s'arrête en 1759; celui qui suivra poussera jusqu'à 1812. Le but du compilateur, le Dr R. A. Preston, a été de réunir "tous les renseignements disponibles sur le fort Frontenac." On a ainsi 213 textes, dont 129 appartiennent au XVII^e siècle. Il n'est pas à prévoir que la critique y relève d'omissions graves. On regrettera néanmoins que le compilateur ait négligé de reproduire une couple de paragraphes de la lettre de Frontenac à Colbert du 13 novembre 1673. Cette pièce est un document capital, puisque le gouverneur y raconte la fondation de son fort. Dans un post-scriptum, il affirme (*Rapport de l'Archiviste de la province de Québec pour 1926-1927*, p. 51), que les Jésuites sont des "gens qui craignaient beaucoup plus que les Sauvages d'être éclairés de près et qui, jugeant bien que cet établissement [le fort Frontenac] peut servir de chemin pour pénétrer un jour jusqu'aux postes qui ne sont occupés et connus que par eux, en voudraient faire voir l'inutilité. . . ." Cette omission est d'autant plus gênante que la compilation reproduit trois textes dans lesquels il apparaît que "les mesmes Pères" et en particulier le P. de Lamberville (que le gouverneur accusera plus tard de trahison) ont chaudement félicité Frontenac d'avoir établi son poste à Cataracoui. Cette contradiction fournit un témoignage de plus sur le caractère compliqué, pour ne pas dire faux, du fameux gouverneur.

Les textes français, qui forment la grande majorité de ceux que renferme cet ouvrage, s'accompagnent d'une traduction anglaise. Celle-ci paraît généralement bonne. Vu l'étendue du recueil, il était cependant difficile d'éviter tout contresens. Par exemple, les premières lignes du document F 46 se lisent comme suit: "M. Hocquart prévoit qu'il sera obligé de reprendre au printemps prochain l'exploitation des forts Frontenac et de Niagara par oëconomie" (p. 430). Le traducteur rend cette dernière expression par "for economy's sake" (p. 234). Et il répète cette méprise (p. 235). Il faut savoir que "par économie" est une expression technique s'appliquant à des travaux "que l'administration fait effectuer directement," par opposition à ceux qu'elle confie à un entrepreneur. "Par oëconomie" ne signifie donc pas "for economy's sake."

Il y aurait beaucoup à dire de l'introduction qu'a écrite le professeur L. Lamontagne, directeur de la section des langues modernes au Collège militaire royal. On doit déplorer qu'elle soit visiblement faite de main d'amateur. En somme, l'auteur s'est donné pour tâche de résumer en quatre-vingts pages l'histoire de la Nouvelle-France depuis 1610 jusqu'à la Conquête. Même pour un historien compétent, un tel travail serait d'une extrême difficulté; pour M. Lamontagne, c'est une gageure, et d'autant plus malaisée à tenir qu'il semble avoir écarté de propos délibéré les résultats des recherches les plus importantes opérées depuis vingt ans sur le régime français. Aussi son exposé se révèle-t-il fautif dans sa conception même. De plus, il est criblé d'erreurs de détail et d'étranges partis pris. Ainsi, aux travaux du professeur W. J. Eccles, qui est un spécialiste des problèmes que soulèvent Frontenac et son époque, il est ridicule d'opposer, comme s'ils pouvaient leur faire contrepoids, ceux de MM. Antoine Roy et Jean Bruchési. Chez les historiens qui ont laissé leur marque sur l'étude de Frontenac et de ses contemporains, le regretté Jean Delanglez devrait venir en tête de liste; or, dans une énumération de ces historiens, le nom de Delanglez n'apparaît même pas (on y trouve, en revanche, celui de Saint-Simon!). La bibliographie, il est vrai, contient deux ouvrages du même Delanglez, mais elle en oublie un qui est essentiel: *Frontenac and the Jesuits* (Chicago, 1939). Du reste, tout se passe comme si M. Lamontagne ne tenait pas compte même des études que sa bibliographie ne passe pas sous silence: celle-ci accueille *Some La Salle Journeys*, où il est démontré que La Salle n'atteignit pas l'Ohio en 1669. Parlant de cette expédition, M. Lamontagne n'en écrit pas moins: "There is no evidence to show whether he reached his objective," ce qui laisse subsister un doute. La vérité est qu'il y a des preuves que La Salle n'atteignit pas l'objectif auquel l'auteur fait allusion. Toujours dans la même expédition, La Salle et ses compagnons auraient, selon M. Lamontagne, rencontré Louis Jolliet; on sait depuis une dizaine d'années qu'ils rencontrèrent plutôt Adrien Jolliet.

Les erreurs que je viens de souligner proviennent de la répugnance que l'auteur manifeste à utiliser des travaux récents et de caractère scientifique. Il commet aussi d'autres méprises qui s'expliquent plus difficilement. Ainsi, il affirme que les Jésuites commencèrent en 1632 leurs travaux au pays des Hurons; nul n'ignore que Brébeuf fit un séjour de trois ans en Huronie, de 1626 à 1629. Il assure que, "d'après le recensement de 1754," la population du Canada s'élevait à 50,000 âmes; le recensement de 1754 donne au Canada 55,009 habitants. Il écrit: "Montcalm, who had no alternative but to follow M. de Vaudreuil's plans and instructions, realized only too well that, with his eight battalions poorly fed and barely equipped, he was outmatched by the twenty-one English regiments, a numerous militia, a powerful navy and wealthy colonies." Quel rapport y a-t-il entre les "plans" de Vaudreuil et la supériorité écrasante des éléments britanni-

ques sur les effectifs français? Ajoutaient-ils à la force numérique des adversaires? Ici, l'insuffisance n'est pas de documentation, mais de logique. Pour la documentation, outre les remarques précédentes, on se voit forcé de formuler celle-ci: sur quatre-vingt-deux notes que comporte l'introduction, quarante et un contiennent des renvois aux *Documents relating to the Colonial History of the State of New York*.

En résumé: bonne compilation; mauvaise introduction.

GUY FRÉGAULT

L'Université de Montréal

Lord Selkirk's Diary 1803-1804: A Journal of His Travels in British North America and the Northeastern United States. Edited with an Introduction by PATRICK C. T. WHITE. Toronto: The Champlain Society. 1958. Pp. xxxii, 360, xvi, illus. Free to members.

THE PUBLICATION of this diary will still further raise the good reputation of Lord Selkirk in the minds of Canadian historians and the public at large. It deals with his visits to Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia in the summer and autumn of 1803, with his journey through Massachusetts and New York in the autumn of the same year, with his sojourn in the Canadas from late 1803 until June of 1804, and finally with a short stop at Halifax on the return homeward. There is an Appendix of scattered notes made by the diarist and the very useful introduction supplies the necessary data on Selkirk's early years and the misfortunes of his later life.

Selkirk made three distinct ventures in his contribution towards the colonization of British North America. The first, that in Prince Edward Island, was un- spectacularly successful. The second, at Baldoon in south-western Ontario, was an unmitigated failure. The third, easily the most spectacular and undoubtedly the best known, was that in Manitoba, probably the most significant because it was symbolic of his determination to extend a belt of British settlement across the continent. Right through the diary this is the theme that seems most remarkable. He came to Prince Edward Island only because Lord Hobart, who was making an honest effort to do something for the Maritimes in 1802, persuaded him to do so by offering easy terms. He was determined to colonize south-western Ontario because of its strategic value in holding back the Yankee thrust to the north and west. But always his ultimate ambitions lay in the heartland of North America.

The rôle of this likeable gentleman adventurer in Canadian history has been justly appreciated. He was one of the makers of the Canadian nation. It is futile but reasonable to hazard a lamentation upon how much more he might have accomplished in peaceful and prosperous times from the chair of a great public office. His diary will probably be of most use to historians of the Maritime provinces where local history still leaves huge, unexplained gaps, especially upon the times in which he was an important principal. Almost everywhere he went on the eastern seaboard he could find communities of men who were desperately seeking clear title to their lands, fearful of being reduced to vassalage through improvident contracts, suspicious of easy terms for tenantry, and, in many cases, insecure in the possession of lands they had tilled and improved for years. In Prince Edward Island free grants had been unknown since the dispensation of 1767. In Nova Scotia they had been suspended owing to the operation of the Royal Instructions of March, 1790.

Selkirk was not a literary diarist. It is plain that he had no intention of committing his reflections to posterity. His only purpose was to compile a volume of memoranda that would aid in the proper conduct of business. For this reason the picture that emerges is fresh, homely, and candid. The Highlanders who settled on the shores of Hillsborough Bay and who so downrightly refused to settle away from tidewater, the Stewarts who refused to place any value whatever on land without frontage on the coast, Father Burke of Halifax who said that he could carry his congregation to Canada on his back, convey in a very vivid way the kind of thing people were saying and doing in this interesting but relatively little known period in the history of the Atlantic provinces.

Though Mr. White's purely local knowledge is not so remarkable as that of other scholars who have produced volumes for the Champlain Society, his footnotes invariably indicate the proper way to find such information.

W. S. MACNUTT

The University of New Brunswick

The Head of the Lake: A History of Wentworth County. By C. M. JOHNSTON. Hamilton: Wentworth County Council. 1958. Pp. xii, 345, illus. \$2.50.

FOR CENTURIES Burlington Bay, at the head of Lake Ontario, was a camping-place for Indians, and the beginning of the trail that led westward to the Grand and Thames rivers. The white man brought settlement, with inns and places of business that catered to the increasing traffic streaming over the "mountain" to the western townships and to Michigan. The trail became a vehicular road, supplemented soon after the middle of the nineteenth century by a railroad. Villages emerged to contest for leadership in the commercial and industrial life of the region. The cutting of the Desjardins Canal in the 1820's gave Dundas access to Burlington Bay, but its expectations of supremacy were not realized. The village of Hamilton, situated on the Bay, soon forged ahead of Dundas and other rivals to become the metropolis at the head of the Lake, destined to grow into a great industrial and forwarding centre, and to exert a dominating influence on an extensive hinterland. Banks and newspapers, good roads and railroads, were the tools of this metropolitanism, not only economic but social and intellectual as well. Hamilton became a city, with all the problems incident to urban and industrial life.

But the story of Hamilton is only one part of an account which attempts, in the author's words, "to chronicle the principal events and forces that have influenced the Head of the Lake from the days of the French Régime to the present." Nearly half the book is taken up with the period before Hamilton won its commanding position over its rivals. This is primarily a county, not an urban history, the writing of which was commissioned by the Centennial Committee of the Wentworth County Council. As such, all aspects of that history, urban and agrarian, economic, political, military, and social, have been treated in detail. Much attention is given to the War of 1812 and to the Rebellion period: the conservative Allan MacNab looms large in political history. The author has been careful to integrate local events and movements with the larger scene, not only in the Canadas but beyond. Occasionally, but not often, the local events appear somewhat inadequate to uphold the weight of general history given them; but the reader is left in no doubt as to the attitude of this important economic centre to, and its place in, broad national issues and movements.

A short Bibliographical Note, and the extensive chapter notes grouped at the end of the book, indicate that the author has made diligent use of the extensive body of published sources, primary and secondary, that pertains to his subject. In addition he has used a number of important collections of private papers in various libraries and in the Public Archives at Toronto and Ottawa, although few public records in the archives were exploited.

Factual mistakes appear to be few in number. On page 120 the London district court house in 1804 is placed in the town of London (which did not then exist) instead of in Charlotteville. One wonders that no mention is made of the Niagara and Detroit Rivers Rail Road Company and its unsuccessful contest with the Great Western Company for the building of the first railroad across the peninsula. But these are minor criticisms. Mr. Johnston has produced a well-written and scholarly book which should rank high on the list of county histories, and be useful to students of the national scene.

FRED C. HAMIL

Wayne State University

Dynamic Decade: The Evolution and Effects of the Oil Industry in Alberta. By ERIC J. HANSON. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Limited, 1958. Pp. xviii, 314, illus. \$5.00.

THE AUTHOR, Professor of Economics at the University of Alberta, has set out to describe and evaluate the impact of the succession of petroleum and natural gas discoveries since 1947 at Leduc, Redwater, Pembina, and many other localities. The dates characterized as the "dynamic decade," 1946-56, permit comparison of two distinct plateaus in the history of the Alberta oil industry, the first while it was being restricted by the dwindling output of the Turner Valley field, the second when dozens of fields were producing to the limits of distant markets reached by pipelines. Both were also census years, and hence useful for the statistical comparisons that are the author's chief means of demonstrating Alberta's growth during the years of development. His training and interest show in the painstaking effort to ascertain the shares that Albertans derived from the various stages of the industry and also to measure its repercussions upon the provincial economy.

Any work on so technical a subject must resort to the language of the geologist, engineer, economist, and statistician, but the present volume has quite successfully overcome this pitfall by offering clear, full explanations of important technical terms. Numerous diagrams, charts and maps supplement the explanations, and the inevitable tables of figures are set out simply and clearly. The result is a good textbook account of the petroleum industry in Alberta which educates the reader in the complexities of the resource, the processes of exploring and drilling, securing land rights, production and transportation, refining, processing and marketing, and the problems of organization, finance, and public regulation. Only occasionally does the exposition stray into cautious statements of opinion. Echoing the attitudes of a province accustomed to "poverty in the midst of plenty," the author stresses the prime importance of markets and pleads for increased natural gas exports. Again, he reflects Alberta's changed financial status (and the educative effects of large-scale foreign investment) by emphasizing the risks borne by various enterprises associated with the boom, and the benign effects for the entire province—not the least being government finance—resulting from investment from abroad.

In a fundamental sense *Dynamic Decade* is also a historical study. It reviews developments in the industry during the sixty-year period since the beginning of prospecting in Alberta, and it offers a detailed tableau of the many-sided progress of the province since 1946. Its focus upon these latest years is also wide enough to embrace consideration of the effects upon regional, national, and continental economies and upon Canadian-American relations. *Dynamic Decade* is a careful and scholarly treatment of a complex, important subject in present day Canadian history.

MORRIS ZASLOW

The University of Toronto

Galloping Head: The Life of The Right Honourable Sir Francis Bond Head 1793-1875. By SYDNEY JACKMAN. London: Phoenix House Ltd. [Toronto: J. M. Dent & Sons (Canada) Limited]. 1958. Pp. 191, illus. \$5.00.

SIR FRANCIS BOND HEAD lived eighty-two fairly strenuous years and spent less than three of them in Canada. It is useful to have a work that puts his term as Lieutenant-Governor of Upper Canada in correct perspective, or, to change the figure, that plots the course of this lesser but properly baleful comet before and after its brief appearance in the Canadian heavens. Not, of course, that Head is only of interest in reference to Canadian events. He was a true Victorian hero: second-class; eminently Victorian, if not wholly eminent; busy, busy, never weary of well-doing (or much concerned whether it were well or ill, as long as it was doing); buoyantly self-confident, ready to take on anything from South American mining superintendent or English poor-law commissioner to the quite unexpected job of Canadian governor. He was supremely conscious of his duty—as he freely interpreted it; nonchalant to danger, whether facing Napoleon before Waterloo or Mackenzie outside Toronto; ardently Tory, but quick to grasp at novelty. Who, after all, was knighted for introducing the lasso to the British Army? And beyond all this, he was no inconsiderable author—quantitatively, at least—as the writer of such works known in the best parlours as *Hi-ways and Dry-ways*, *Stokers and Pokers*, and *Bubbles from the Brunnens of Nassau*. It seems almost excessively in character that he was also devoted to hunting, and when advanced age forced him to give it up followed the hounds in make-believe on a garden swing.

Head's whole life, then, is worth examination, quite apart from its short Canadian chapter—and even apart from the light it throws specifically on his conduct in this country. It is in this sense that Mr. Jackman's concise biography is most rewarding. It is a clear, conscientious, and scholarly appreciation, that makes good use of Head and Murray private manuscript material. Nevertheless, as the author recognizes, the climax of Sir Francis' career came in Canada. Indeed, however colourful the rest of it, its significance must still rest largely on the fact that Head was governor of a major British colony at a highly critical moment. In this regard, Mr. Jackman's book is less rewarding. Though he gives a fair degree of space to Head in Canada, he does not really add much to what William Smith wrote in 1930-1. There seems little evidence of new materials here, or of work done in the archives at Ottawa and Toronto. It would appear that the key Canadian part had been handled at a distance, chiefly from standard secondary sources and Head's own *Narrative*.

Moreover, while Mr. Jackman is frequently critical of Head's conduct in Canada, or even tongue-in-cheek in reporting the governor's airy misconceptions

and misjudgments, he still seems at times to get entangled in Head's own attitudes and terminology. Thus one loses the significance of the bank crisis in destroying the governor's popularity in 1837. It was rather just the "fanatic section of the Radical Party" that worked to upset Sir Francis' happy picture of the most tranquil of provinces. Incidentally "Radical" and "Reform" are interchanged pretty freely, without much apparent awareness of a difference. Robert Baldwin, too, is repeatedly included as a Radical, and "Dissenting Sects," and "the loyal party" also suggest that Sir Francis is doing the talking.

Yet it is understandable, and by no means always a fault, for a biographer to come to see things as his subject might. In any case it is still true that in the main things this author can stand back and judge his man effectively. But in one way, throughout, Head is not fairly treated. Quite plainly his life was full of dash and sparkle. This book is not. A somewhat wooden style of presentation detracts from its intrinsically interesting material. It is a useful book, a commendable book; but there is not the fun or profit in it that one might otherwise have found.

J. M. S. CARELESS

The University of Toronto

The South in the Revolution. III. A History of the South. By JOHN RICHARD ALDEN. Edited by WENDELL HOLMES STEPHENSON and E. MENTON COULTER. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1957. Pp. xvi, 442. \$9.50.

PROFESSOR ALDEN has here presented the history of Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and the "old southwest" during the period between the promulgation of the "Grenville Program" of English colonial policy and the ratification of the second constitution of the United States.

The story is told in a conventional manner, and is based in large measure upon Professor Alden's own researches. After a two-chapter survey of the internal economic and social life of the southern states at the beginning of the Revolutionary era, the story proceeds according to the conventional chronological arrangement: "Mr. Grenville's Program" (chap. iv) and the reactions of the southern states to it (chap. v, vi); "The Townshend Crisis" (chap. vii); the "Advance into the Old South-west" (chap. viii); "Sectional Clash" (chap. ix); and "Tea and Trumpets" (chap. x). Chapters xi, xiii, xiv, xv, and xvi trace the history of the military actions that took place in the southern states. Chapter xii, "Separation and Union," briefly traces the participation of the southern states in the sequence of events that included the adoption of the Declaration of Independence and the Articles of Confederation; chapters xvii, xviii, xix, xx, and xxi review the "reconstruction" of the southern states in the post-war years and their participation in the formulation and ratification of the Constitution of 1787.

The book is sound and adequate, and partially deflates a few old myths, such as the old exaggeration of the profundity of the conflict between "the west" and "the east" (chap. ix). The most surprising thing about the book may be the impression it gives of the essentially integrated position of the southern states in what Professor Alden seems to consider a very high degree of American national unity (chap. xii, for example, especially pp. 208-9). Only in the constitutional convention, and especially on the question of the slave trade, did a genuinely "sectional" southern consciousness appear. From this book it would almost appear that there was no such thing as "The South." If that be a true implication, and if the southern states, in their thinking and their actions, were so integrally united

with the northern states as this book seems to show, one might wonder a bit how a history of "The South" can be justified. If "The South" did not become a distinct reality until, say, the era of John C. Calhoun, how can one write a history of it before that time?

But this is only an academic question. The book is a sound and useful survey.

MAX SAVELLE

The University of Washington

We the People: The Economic Origins of the Constitution. By FORREST McDONALD. Chicago: University of Chicago Press [Toronto: University of Toronto Press]. 1958. Pp. xii, 436. \$7.00.

WHEN CHARLES A. BEARD'S *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States* appeared in 1913, it was immediately recognized as an epoch-making interpretation of the Constitution. Liberals hailed and welcomed it as a potent weapon against monopoly capitalism and against the Supreme Court, which they saw as the last refuge of the Gospel of Wealth. Conservatives, on the other hand, were scandalized by Beard's bold assertion that the Constitution was an economic document drawn up not by demi-gods but by selfish men who were anxious to set up a new government to protect their own property interests. Few books have made as immediate and lasting an impact on the writing of American history as Beard's study.

While many historians have felt that Beard presented an over-simplified picture of the battle surrounding the drawing up of the Constitution, few of them have been willing to wade through the mass of material dealing with the subject in order to present a careful and documented refutation. This state of affairs has now come to an end. Two¹ recent books have not only challenged Beard's thesis but have reduced it to a rather naïve and superficial appraisal of the problem.

Professor McDonald, executive secretary of the American Historical Research Center, has undertaken the task of examining Beard's thesis. He accepts Beard's system of interpretation and testing and makes the same assumptions. He then sets out to challenge Beard's documented data and to question whether the thesis is compatible with the facts. The author presents a carefully documented analysis of both the economic interests and votes of the delegates at the Philadelphia Convention and the various state conventions called to ratify the Constitution. He finds that the men who drew up the Constitution represented an "almost complete cross-section" of the geographic areas and of the shades of political opinion in the United States in 1787. And to say, as Beard does, that the delegates represented a consolidated economic group with an identity of personal interest is "an oversimplification that requires many qualifications." Moreover, to examine the proceedings within the Convention in terms of economic interest presents "insurmountable obstacles."

Professor McDonald devotes the major part of his study to the struggle over ratification. Here too he finds the Beardian class-struggle interpretation not valid. In the five states in favour of the Constitution, in no case was the Constitution ratified without the "consent of the farmers and a majority of the friends of paper money." In Maryland the struggle was almost precisely the opposite of that

¹See also Robert E. Brown, *Charles A. Beard and the Constitution: A Critical Analysis of An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution* (Princeton, 1956).

depicted by Beard. In the four states that were divided over ratification "none of Beard's proposition holds," because wealth was equally divided between the two sides. He concludes that the economic interpretation in these four states is fundamentally "without factual foundation." In the four states opposed to the ratification of the Constitution Professor McDonald finds that in North Carolina there was no division along economic lines, while in Rhode Island the traditional explanation has no basis in fact. In Virginia the property holdings of the two warring groups were identical. Moreover, Beard also overlooked the fact that more than a quarter of the delegates to the Virginia Convention were farmers. In New York neither party to the conflict had a monopoly on economic interests of any kind. Beard's view that the conflict was between security holders and the advocates of paper money is "self-contradictory," because the two were almost synonymous. The author concludes that it is impossible to devise a simple set of alignments on the issue of ratification in order to explain the contest as one in which economic self-interest was the principal motivating force.

Professor McDonald concludes with the common sense statement that no single system of interpretation can explain all historical phenomena, and that the Constitution was the product of a number of conflicting elements. He admits, of course, that the economic interpretation does render intelligible many of the forces at work in the making of the Constitution. In the process of proving the inadequacy of the Beardian thesis, again and again he states: "This generalization is groundless;" "The opposite is true;" "On all counts then Beard's thesis is entirely incompatible with the facts." The reader is overwhelmed by the mass of material which the author brings to bear on the subject. There is no doubt that the economic interpretation of the Constitution in Beardian terms does not work. One may look forward with anticipation and curiosity to the interpretation that Professor McDonald will make, since he proposes to devote two volumes to writing "something meaningful" about the making of the Constitution.

EZIO CAPPADOCIA

The Royal Military College of Canada

Great Basin Kingdom: An Economic History of the Latter-Day Saints, 1830-1900.

By LEONARD J. ARRINGTON. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press [Toronto: S. J. Reginald Saunders and Company Limited]. 1958. Pp. xx, 534. \$10.85.

Great Basin Kingdom is a study in what might be termed "theocratic mercantilism." In Mormon theology the material and the spiritual are inseparable, hence economy and church are one. Professor Arrington describes the remarkably ingenious efforts of Mormon leaders to build the Kingdom of God in the American West and to guard it from Gentile assaults by making it self-sufficient. He argues convincingly that the programme was more pervasive, consistent, and long-lived than we have thought. Self-sufficiency was not attained, of course, and so much wealth and effort were dissipated in the attempt that the Saints needed a frequent *deus ex machina* in the form of free-spending Forty-Niners or railroad builders in order to survive. Arrington's book is comprehensive and plausible in its main points, and it contains few traces of the polemic that once marked accounts of Mormonism. It is at once a storehouse of information about Mormon enterprises and a scholarly brief for those who believe that ideas and habits had greater effect than physical environment upon frontier life.

Some readers may wish that the author had done a few things differently. He is more generous with detail than with perspective. Thus his ventures beyond the Great Basin are infrequent and unconvincing, and his accounts of Mormon projects reveal surprisingly little about the economy in which they were launched—the agricultural practices, land ownership, prices, and the distribution of wealth. His decision to neglect Utah's Gentiles and his unconcern for parallel ventures in controlled development of the West sponsored by various corporations leave a misleading impression of Mormon independence and uniqueness. Writing and analysis are uneven; some chapters are lively, lucid, and fascinating, and others are catalogues of ill-digested information and obscure, prolix prose. In general, the author seems in many sections to have recorded without reflecting, and his book is therefore less appealing than it might easily have been.

Great Basin Kingdom is a handsome volume, and its Notes and Bibliography are splendid in their extent and organization. The book is less distinguished than it might have been, but it is likely to remain a useful, even indispensable, reference on a subject of perennial interest.

WALLACE D. FARNHAM

The University of Alberta

Robert Lansing and American Neutrality, 1914-1917. By DANIEL M. SMITH.
University of California Publications in History, LIX. Berkeley and Los Angeles:
University of California Press. 1958. Pp. vi, 241. \$5.00.

WHY, AND ON WHOSE responsibility, did the United States reverse her traditional policy of non-involvement in the affairs of Europe in 1917? It is the contention of Dr. Daniel Smith that Robert Lansing, Bryan's successor as Secretary of State in the Wilson administration, played a major role in the policies that brought the American Republic into the hostilities. Lansing, according to the writer, was a statesman possessing a "large measure of realistic vision and the ability to act upon it." As early as mid-1915 he had become convinced that the national self-interest of the United States was closely involved in the Allied cause. He therefore acted upon the belief that the United States should pursue a course of action which would at least not hinder the Allied war effort, and if possible, aid it. The author holds that it was not simply the unrestricted warfare of the Germans nor the economic and ideological interests of the United States, which in the final analysis determined his country's intervention. It was rather a growing recognition that the interests of the United States in the world balance of power could no longer be isolated from the rest of the world. The German decision to engage in unrestricted submarine warfare was thus only the occasion, and not the cause of American intervention.

For Canadian readers it is perhaps worth noting, that though we are constantly attempting to assess every U.S. reaction to our international policies, Canada's participation in the Great War seems to have played no immediate part in the American attitude to it. John MacCormac's description of Canada as "America's Problem," seems hardly applicable to the 1914-17 period, nor on many other occasions one suspects.

RAMSAY COOK

The University of Toronto

Noted

William "Tiger" Dunlop: *"Blackwoodian Backwoodsman."* Selected and edited by CARL F. KLINCK. Toronto: The Ryerson Press. 1958. Pp. xii, 185. \$5.00.

THE PURPOSE of this book is to throw more light on a well-known but nevertheless rather shadowy figure in the history of Upper Canada. The editor has selected pieces written by Dunlop during the various phases of his life, in India, Britain, and Canada, interlarding these with his own explanatory comments and with some accounts of Dunlop by his own contemporaries. The editor's approach is that of a literary historian. He is not concerned with Dunlop's place in the political or economic history of the province, but with his rôle as a transplanter of culture, "how the life and letters of the Old World came to the New." Dunlop was a minor figure in pre-Victorian literary circles who brought an "earthy yet urbane, masculine yet sensitive, positive yet imaginative" style of writing to Canada which contributed to the founding of this country's literature. This thesis is, however, only suggested, not worked out; the main value of the book is to place Dunlop in his literary setting, and to make readily available extracts from some of his writings. It is useful, for instance, to be reminded of Dunlop's recipe for hot whisky toddy: "put the spoon in the tumbler and fill up with boiling water; then, when the glass was thoroughly heated pour out the water, fill with whiskey, and drink quickly." This passage is one of several quoted from the Misses Lizar's *In the Days of the Canada Company* (1896), and it is in the pages of that book that Dunlop will continue to live. Still, Professor Klinck has added some interesting lines to the portrait.

A Check List of Canadian Literature and Background Materials, 1628-1950. Compiled for the Humanities Research Council of Canada by REGINALD EYRE WATERS. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1959. Pp. xx, 789. \$15.00.

THIS CHECK LIST represents a notable advance in Canadian studies, for which the author, publisher, and the Humanities Research Council are to be congratulated. Part I lists (in over 300 pages) "all known titles in the recognized forms of poetry, fiction, and drama that were produced by English-speaking Canadians up to 1950." But it is Part II that will prove to be of more value to historians. Although the list of background materials—military, economic, and constitutional history are omitted on the grounds that they have no immediate relationship to literature—is selective, rather than complete, it is by no means superficial. New titles, bibliographical aids, and so on spring up on almost every one of the 400 pages given to Part II. A list of the chapter titles will give a good idea of the material included: bibliography, biography, education, essays and addresses, local history, religion and morality, social history, scholarship, travel and description.

Democracy in the Dominions: A Comparative Study in Institutions. By ALEXANDER BRADY. Third edition. Issued under the auspices of The Canadian Institute of International Affairs and The Royal Institute of International Affairs. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1958. Pp. x, 614. \$7.95.

ORIGINALLY PUBLISHED in 1947, Professor Brady's study has now become a classic. The third edition has been revised to include the changes which have

taken place in South Africa since 1952, as well as less striking events in the three other Dominions treated in the book. The Canadian and South African elections of 1958 are both discussed and the Bibliography has also been brought up to date.

Rapport de l'Archiviste de la province de Québec pour 1955-1956 et 1956-1957. Nos. 36-37. By ANTOINE ROY. Québec: Imprimeur de Sa Majesté la Reine. 1958. Pp. viii, 553.

OF PARTICULAR INTEREST and importance in this collection are the letters from Papineau to his wife between 1843 and 1862, edited by M. Fernand Ouellet. For those working in church and church-state history, Father Léon Pouliot's calendar of Bishop Bourget's correspondence for 1844 will offer a useful guide. A petition from the inhabitants of Quebec to Lord Durham, 3 October 1838; an inventory of "la saberdache" of Jacques Viger; a bibliographical dictionary of the militia of Vaudreuil and Soulanges; and a continuation of Father Godbout's bibliographical studies of seventeenth century Canadian families complete the report. All in all the volume is adequate evidence that the publication of documents by provincial archives is an excellent service.

Le Dictionnaire général de la langue française au Canada. Compiled and edited by LOUIS-ALEXANDRE BELISLE. Québec: Belisle, Editeur. Pp. xvi, 1390, illus. \$25.00.

M. BELISLE has performed an extremely useful service in compiling a dictionary of the French language "telle qu'on la parle et telle qu'on la comprend au Canada français." Apart from its general value it should be of particular use to historians working in French-Canadian manuscript sources who often find standard French dictionaries of little help in determining the precise meaning of words and phrases peculiar to French Canada. The book is a must for every reference library and archives.

Star Chamber Stories. By G. R. ELTON. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd. [Toronto: The Ryerson Press]. 1958. Pp. 244. \$4.25.

MR. ELTON'S TITLE to this first-rate fascinating collection of six essays is self-explanatory. As he states in the Introduction: "For once, the familiar but faintly unreal paths of historical study looked like running through reasonably open country where normally they are hemmed in by a forest impenetrable in its gloomy and permanent obscurity. It proved possible, for a little while, to get away both from the towering figures of political history and from the abstractions of the economic and social historian—possible to learn something about people who would never ordinarily make the headlines. . . ." In these stories the author breathes life into Tudor constitutional and social history.

Exeter, 1549-1640: The Growth of an English County Town. By WALLACE T. MACCAFFREY. Harvard Historical Monographs, XXXV. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press [Toronto: S. J. Reginald Saunders and Company Limited]. 1958. Pp. xii, 311, maps. \$7.25.

THE SOCIAL, economic, and political life of Exeter during a crucial century is examined in great detail in this volume by Professor MacCaffrey of Haverford

College. The distinctions which then existed between borough and county society are admirably depicted, and the mercantile character of the community is abundantly illustrated. Over one-third of the book is devoted to an excellent analysis of local politics—the institutions of local government, the oligarchical character of politics, the relations between the borough and the royal administration, and the reaction of the community to the great issues of the era. Local history in this volume is successfully related to the life of the county, region and nation. The account is based chiefly on the manuscripts of the City and Bishopric of Exeter.

King James IV of Scotland: A Brief Survey of his Life and Times. By R. L. MACKIE. Edinburgh and London: Oliver & Boyd [Toronto: Clarke, Irwin & Company Limited]. 1958. Pp. xii, 300. \$5.75.

THERE IS REALLY very little to say about King James IV of Scotland, except that he was a romantic fool. Mr. Mackie has therefore concentrated most of his efforts on the Scotland of James IV. The result is rather a formless and rag-bag book; it is to be commended however, because there is a serious shortage of clear and scholarly historical writing on Scotland.

Essays on the Later Stuarts. By GODFREY DAVIES. San Marino: The Huntington Library. 1958. Pp. xii, 133, illus. \$4.00.

THIS HANDSOMELY produced volume contains three papers which Godfrey Davies had prepared for publication just prior to his death. "Charles II in 1660" was meant to be a continuation of Davies' last book, *The Restoration of Charles II* (1955), and this paper presents a character sketch of Charles at the time of his arrival in London on May 29, 1660. In "Tory Churchmen and James II," Davies retells the story of James II's alienation of his most loyal supporters, the members of the Anglican Church. The last paper systematically assesses the great personal influence of William III in the determination of British foreign policy. None of these papers present new points of view, but they are all based on contemporary materials and are unusually informative. The volume includes a complete Bibliography of Davies' writings, compiled by Paul Hardacre.

Dean Church: The Anglican Response to Newman. By B. A. SMITH. London and Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1958. Pp. xiv, 334, illus. \$6.00.

THIS BIOGRAPHY is not in fact mainly concerned with the Tractarian Movement and its relations with Rome, as the sub-title might seem to suggest. It puts Dean Church in his larger context, and demonstrates his importance to the intellectual life of Victorian England as a whole. Mr. Smith never quite shows wherein Church's greatness lay, but he has done a competent and useful job in an area where biography too readily becomes hagiography.

The Later Churchills. By A. L. ROWSE. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd. [Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited]. 1958. Pp. xvi, 528, illus. \$6.75.

IN THIS VOLUME Professor Rowse completes his study of the Churchill family in support of his thesis that "people and families are the real unities and entities

of history—not arguments and abstractions.” The book swings along in fine style, interesting, amusing, and sometimes clever, but breaks down when we come to the period of Lord Randolph and his son, Winston. The book then becomes a biography of these two men neither concise enough to be trenchant, nor long enough to be convincingly analytic. There is a ninth, and a tenth Duke, it seems, but Mr. Rowse does not bother to make that point too clear.

The British Isles and the American Colonies: Great Britain and Ireland 1748–1754. I. The British Empire before the American Revolution. By LAWRENCE HENRY GIPSON. New York: Alfred A. Knopf [Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Limited]. 1958. Pp. xxxvi, 246, xxii, maps. \$8.50.

IN 1936 PROFESSOR GIPSON published the first of what is now a nine volume history of the Empire before the American Revolution. Since that time scholars, following the lead given by Namier, have profoundly altered the interpretation of eighteenth century political history. Not content with rushing his series to its conclusion, Professor Gipson has brought out a new and revised edition of the original volume. Both the texts and the footnotes reveal the nature of the new material he has used. The writing is much improved. There is a completely new additional chapter on Wales. And Knopf, who did not publish the original but who now handles the series, has done its usual superb work in printing and binding.

Winston Churchill and the Second Front, 1940–1943. By TRUMBULL HIGGINS. New York and Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1957. Pp. xii, 281. \$6.50.

PROFESSOR HIGGINS here argues that Churchill's wartime leadership was based on an unsound strategic conception, which not only prolonged the war by diverting valuable resources to the Mediterranean, the Pacific, and the war in the air, but so undermined American confidence that his sound political strategy in the last months of the war was rejected. It is a fascinating and provocative study of a wide range of memoir and monographic literature, a little too clever, perhaps, and unfortunately the author wildly overstates his case and weakens the effort of his arguments (many of which merit serious consideration) by sarcasm and gratuitous denunciation.

History of the United States Civil Service. By PAUL P. VAN RIFER. Evanston, Ill., and White Plains, N.Y.: Row, Peterson and Company [Toronto: The Copp Clark Publishing Co. Ltd.]. 1957. Pp. xviii, 588. \$9.00.

THIS BOOK PROVIDES a fairly detailed history of the administrative arm of American government, with a brief discussion of the pre-Civil War era and an extended account of the controversies surrounding efforts at reform in the last ninety years. The author stresses that, while the idea of a non-political civil service was borrowed from Europe, especially Britain, it was adapted to fit the distinctive characteristics of American society. It remained more politically oriented than in European countries. Despite the well-publicized corruption, this orientation was a source of strength, helping the American civil service to be “both unusually responsive and responsible to the democracy which it supports,” compared with bureaucracies in other countries.

Recent Publications Relating to Canada

PREPARED IN THE EDITORIAL OFFICE OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO PRESS
BY PAULA ARMSTRONG

NOTICE in this bibliography does not preclude a later and more extended review.

The following abbreviations are used: *B.R.H.*—*Bulletin des recherches historiques*; *C.H.R.*—*Canadian Historical Review*; *C.J.E.P.S.*—*Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*; *R.H.A.F.*—*Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française*.

See also *Canadians*, a monthly list of Canadian publications prepared by the National Library, Ottawa; *External Affairs*, published monthly by the Department of External Affairs; *Journal of the Parliaments of the Commonwealth*, issued quarterly by the General Council of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association; and, in the *University of Toronto Quarterly*, "Letters in Canada," published in the July issue.

Sections of the bibliography omitted from this issue for reasons of space will be included in later issues.

I. CANADA'S COMMONWEALTH AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

- ALEXANDER, F., et al. *The Commonwealth Story: A Course of Selected Readings by Authorities*. Revised edition. London: International University Society [New York: Collings, Inc.]. 1958. Pp. xxxii, 337. \$4.50.
- BENIANS, E. A., BUTLER, JAMES, and CARRINGTON, C. E., eds. *The Cambridge History of the British Empire*. III. *The Empire-Commonwealth, 1870-1919*. Cambridge: At the University Press [Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited]. 1959. Pp. xxii, 948. \$19.50. To be reviewed later.
- DAVIS, JOHN. Canadian Energy Policy (*Behind the Headlines*, XVIII (6), March, 1959. Pp. 16. \$.20).
- GELLNER, JOHN. Problems of Canadian Defence (*Behind the Headlines*, XVIII (5), Dec., 1958. Pp. 14. \$.20).
- GUTTERIDGE, W. F. Canada's Foreign Policy (*Contemporary Review*, no. 1117, Jan., 1959, 30-3). A review of the development of Canadian foreign policy.
- LIPSON, LESLIE. Party Systems in the United Kingdom and the Older Commonwealth: Causes, Resemblances, and Variations (*Political Studies*, VII (1), Feb., 1959, 12-31).
- SPENCER, ROBERT A. *Canada in World Affairs: From UN to NATO 1946-1949*. Issued under the auspices of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs. Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1959. Pp. xii, 447. \$5.00. To be reviewed later.
- Canadian Foreign Policy—Conservative Style (*Behind the Headlines*, XVIII (3), Oct., 1958. Pp. 16. \$.20).

II. HISTORY OF CANADA

(1) General History

- BERTRAND, J. P. *Highway of Destiny: An Epic Story in Canadian Development*. New York: Vantage Press, Inc. 1959. Pp. 301. \$4.50. To be reviewed later.
- DEHLER, RONALD. Immigration on Canadian Unity: A Philosophical Note (*Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa*, XXIX (2), avril-juin 1959, 228-32).
- MCINNIS, EDGAR. *Canada: A Political and Social History*. Revised and enlarged edition. New York and Toronto: Rinehart & Company Inc. 1959. Pp. xviii, 619. \$7.00. To be reviewed later.
- MAHON, JOHN K. Anglo-American Methods of Indian Warfare, 1676-1794 (*Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XLV (2), Sept., 1958, 254-75).
- UNDERHILL, FRANK H., ed. *The Canadian Northwest: Its Potentialities; Symposium Presented to the Royal Society of Canada in 1958-L'Avenir du Nord-Ouest Canadien; Colloque présenté à la Société Royale du Canada en 1958*. "Studia Varia" Series, 3. Toronto: University of Toronto Press for the Society. 1959. Pp. viii, 104. \$4.00.

(3) New France

- ECCLES, W. J. *Frontenac: The Courtier Governor*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Limited. 1959. Pp. x, 416. \$6.50. To be reviewed later.
- GROULX, LIONEL. Frontenac vs l'abbé de Fénélon: Une tragi-comédie judiciaire (*R.H.A.F.*, XII (3), déc. 1958, 358-71). L'auteur discute l'affaire Perrot-Fénélon-Frontenac.
- HUTCHISON, PAUL P. The Seigniorship of La Petite Nation (*Canadian Bar Journal*, II (1), Feb., 1959, 25-30, 54, 63). The author discusses the history of the Papineau Seigniorship, the present site of the Seigniorship Club on the Ottawa River.
- RÉCHEHER, JEAN-FÉLIX. *Journal du Siège de Québec en 1759*. Cahiers d'Histoire de la Société Historique de Québec, no. 11. Québec: Université Laval. 1959. Pp. 48. \$.75. Le journal réédité à l'occasion du deuxième centenaire du siège de Québec.

(4) British North America before 1867

- BRUNET, MICHEL. Les Canadiens après la Conquête: Les débuts de la résistance passive (*R.H.A.F.*, XII (2), sept. 1958, 170-207).
- HARVEY, D. C., and FERGUSON, C. BRUCE, eds. *The Diary of Simeon Perkins, 1780-1789*. Toronto: The Champlain Society. 1958. Pp. lviii, 531. Free to members. To be reviewed later.
- HITSMAN, J. MACKAY, ed. A Medical Officer's Winter Journey in Canada (*Canadian Army Journal*, XII (4), Oct., 1958, 46-64). The journal of Dr. H. Chalmers Miles describing his winter in Canada, 1861-2.
- JONES, WILBUR DEVEREUX, ed. A British View of the War of 1812 and the Peace Negotiations (*Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, LXV (3), Dec., 1958, 481-7). Excerpts from the unpublished autobiography of Henry Goulburn, one of the three British representatives to the peace negotiations in 1814.
- MCCORISON, MARCUS A. The Bayley-Hazen Military Road (*Vermont History*, XXVII (1), Jan., 1959, 57-68). The history of the road built for the invasion of Lower Canada during the American Revolution.
- MACMILLAN, SOMERLED. *The Emigration of Lochaber MacMillans to Canada in 1802*. Ipswich, Mass.: Privately printed. 1958. Pp. 13. An account of early emigration by the present historian of the Clan MacMillan.
- MOORE, JIM. The Tempestuous Earl of Dundonald (*Imperial Oil Review*, XL (1), Feb., 1959, 21-3). The career of Lord Cochrane as commander of the British North American and West Indian fleet.
- OUELLET, FERNAND, ed. *Lettres de Louis-Joseph Papineau à sa femme, 1843-1862 (Rapport de l'Archiviste de la province de Québec pour 1955-1956 et 1956-1957: Nos. 36-37*. Québec: Imprimeur de Sa Majesté la Reine. 1958. 253-375).

- POULIOT, LÉON. Correspondence de Monseigneur Ignace Bourget pour l'année 1844 (*Rapport de l'Archiviste de la province de Québec pour 1955-1956 et 1956-1957: Nos. 36-37*. Québec: Imprimeur de Sa Majesté la Reine. 1958. 177-221).
- WINKS, ROBIN W. The Second Chesapeake Affair (*American Neptune*, XIX (1), Jan., 1959, 51-72). A discussion of the Confederate attempt to create Anglo-American tension in the Maritimes during the American Civil War.

(5) Canada since 1867

- FRANKEL, S. J. Staff Relations in the Civil Service: Who Represents the Government? (*C.J.E.P.S.*, XXV (1), Feb., 1959, 11-22).
- GOODSPEED, D. J. *A History of the Defence Research Board of Canada*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer. 1958. Pp. xii, 259.
- HEENEY, A. D. P. Civil Service Reform, 1958 (*C.J.E.P.S.*, XXV (1), Feb., 1959, 1-10). Revised version of a paper delivered at the annual meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, June, 1958.
- HODGETTS, J. E. The Executive in the Modern State: Canada (*International Social Science Bulletin*, X (2), 1958, 198-212).
- OLSON, ROBERT. A Challenging New Concept of French Canada (*Maclean's*, LXXII (4), Feb. 14, 1959, 24-7). Comments on Philippe Garigue's views on French Canada today.
- SHAPIRO, SAMUEL. Problems of International Arbitration: The Halifax Fisheries Commission of 1877 (*Essex Institute Historical Collections*, XCV (1), Jan., 1959, 21-31).
- WOODCOCK, GEORGE. Louis Riel: Defender of the Past (*History Today*, IX (3), March, 1959, 198-207). Illustrated.

III. PROVINCIAL AND LOCAL HISTORY

(1) Newfoundland and the Maritime Provinces

- CALLBECK, LORNE C. Sagas of the Strait (*Atlantic Advocate*, XLIX (6), Feb., 1959, 58-61). Tales of Northumberland Strait. Illustrated.
- CLARK, ANDREW HILL. *Three Centuries and the Island: A Historical Geography of Settlement and Agriculture in Prince Edward Island, Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1959. Pp. xiv, 287, maps. \$10.00. To be reviewed later.
- DUNN, CHARLES W. Gaelic Proverbs in Nova Scotia (*Journal of American Folklore*, LXXII (283), Jan.-March, 1959, 30-5).
- Report of the Board of Trustees of the Public Archives of Nova Scotia for the Year 1957*. Halifax: Queen's Printer. 1958. Pp. 36. Contains the report of Captain Matthew Floyer of a march by the Shebenaccadia River in 1754 and a series of Howe-Annand letters dealing with the Anti-Confederation League.

(2) The Province of Quebec

- BECK, J. W. Quebec and the Canadian Elections of 1958 (*Parliamentary Affairs*, XII (1), winter, 1958-9, 89-102).
- BIRD, J. BRIAN. Recent Economic Developments in Northern Quebec and Labrador (*Polar Record*, IX (61), Jan., 1959, 308-13).
- COLLINS, ROBERT. Valleyfield: From Seigneurie to Seaway (*Imperial Oil Review*, XLIII (2), April, 1959, 21-4). Illustrated.
- ROY, ANTOINE. *Rapport de l'Archiviste de la province de Québec pour 1955-1956 et 1956-1957: Nos. 36-37*. Québec: Imprimeur de Sa Majesté la Reine. 1958. Pp. viii, 553.
- THÉORÉT, PIERRE-EUCHER. Figure de prêtre (*R.H.A.F.*, XII (3), déc. 1958, 387-406). Une chapitre d'une biographie à paraître sous le titre *Le Bon Monsieur Lussier*. L'auteur discute les luttes auxquelles Lussier avait prendre part (1871-81).

(3) The Province of Ontario

- DRURY, E. C. *All for a Beaver Hat: A History of Early Simcoe County*. Toronto: The Ryerson Press. 1959. Pp. xvi, 160. \$3.50. To be reviewed later.

- EMERSON, J. NORMAN, ed. *New Pages of Prehistory*, 1958 (*Ontario History*, LI (1), winter, 1959, 49-72). Brief descriptions of recent archaeological explorations in Ontario.
- HITSMAN, J. MACKAY. *Please Send Us a Garrison* (*Ontario History*, L (4), autumn, 1958, 189-92). The author discusses the attempts made by Mayor James Dougall of Windsor for a new British regiment to be sent to Windsor in 1861 in view of increasing Anglo-American tensions.
- HOME, RUTH M. *The Diary of Aaron Wismer (1844-1931)*, Jordan, Ontario (*Ontario History*, LI (1), winter, 1959, 39-42).
- HUMPHRIES, CHARLES W. *The Capture of York* (*Ontario History*, LI (1), winter, 1959, 1-21).
- PRESTON, RICHARD A., ed. *Kingston before the War of 1812*. Ontario Series, III. Toronto: The Champlain Society for the Government of Ontario; University of Toronto Press. 1959. Pp. cxvi, 428. \$5.00. To be reviewed later.
- SPRAGGE, GEORGE W. *The Great Seals and the Arms of Ontario* (*Ontario History*, LI (1), winter, 1959, 32-7). Illustrated.
- WARNER, MABEL V. *Memorials at Lundy's Lane* (*Ontario History*, LI (1), winter, 1959, 43-8). The author describes some of the memorials dating from the Battle of Lundy's Lane, July 25, 1814.
- Western Ontario Historical Notes*, XV (1), March, 1959. Pp. 23. Contains various articles reprinted from the centennial issue of the *Erie News* (later the *Simcoe Reformer*) which was published in September, 1958.

(4) The Prairie Provinces

- LOGGIE, MARGARET. *Fort Dunvegan* (*Alberta Historical Review*, VII (1), winter, 1959, 18-26). The early history of the settlement. Illustrated.
- MCQUARRIE, A. H. *The 1913 Provincial Election* (*Alberta Historical Review*, VII (1), winter, 1959, 10-13). Recollections of a Peace River election. Illustrated.
- Saskatchewan Archives. *Eighth Report of the Saskatchewan Archives Board: For the Period June 1, 1956, to May 31, 1958*. Regina: Minister of Education. 1958. Pp. 34.
- WILLOCK, ROGER. *Green Jackets on the Red River* (*Canadian Army Journal*, XIII (1), Jan., 1959, 31-54). The story of the Red River Expedition of 1870.

(6) Northwest Territories, Yukon, and the Arctic

- BERTON, PIERRE. *Klondike: The Life and Death of the Last Great Gold Rush*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Limited. 1958. Pp. viii, 458. \$6.00. To be reviewed later.
- LACROIX, MARC. *Integration or Disintegration?* (*Beaver*, outfit 289, spring, 1959, 37-40). Reflections on the evolution of the Eskimo.
- MARSDEN, MICHAEL. *Arctic Contrasts: Canada and Russia in the Far North* (*International Journal*, XIV (1), winter, 1958-9, 33-41).
- WALKER, FRANK. *Overland Trail to the Klondike* (*Alberta Historical Review*, VII (1), winter, 1959, 1-7). Recollections of a trip in 1898. Illustrated.
- WILMOT, L. F. *Robert Machray—Missionary Statesman* (Historical and Scientific Society of Manitoba, *Papers*, series III, no. 13, 1958, 48-59). The career of Machray, appointed Bishop of Rupert's Land in 1865.
- ZASLOW, MORRIS. "A Prelude to Self-Government: The Northwest Territories 1905-1939" (*The Canadian Northwest: Its Potentialities*. Edited by FRANK H. UNDERHILL. Toronto: University of Toronto Press for the Royal Society of Canada. 1959. Pp. 90-104).

IV. EDUCATIONAL HISTORY

- BRYNER, CYRIL. *Canada: The Soviet View* (*Saturday Night*, LXXIV (4), Feb. 14, 1959, 20-22). A discussion of the current Soviet interpretation of Canadian history.
- GARIGUE, PHILIPPE. *La Faculté des sciences sociales de l'Université de Montréal* (*Culture*, XIX (4), déc. 1958, 391-8).

- MORTON, A. S. *Saskatchewan: The Making of a University*. Revised and edited by CARLYLE KING. Toronto: Published for the University of Saskatchewan by the University of Toronto Press. 1959. Pp. viii, 120. \$2.50. A history of the University of Saskatchewan from its establishment in 1907 to 1919-20, the end of its formative period, written by Carlyle King from a manuscript originally drafted by A. S. Morton. A short epilogue is included on the presidency of Dr. W. C. Murray.
- PENFIELD, WILDER. The Liberal Arts in Canada (*Dalhousie Review*, XXXVIII (4), winter, 1959, 497-507). A lecture delivered at Prince of Wales College, Charlottetown, P.E.I., in October, 1958.
- YOUNG, SCOTT. The Northland's Bunkhouse Professors (*Imperial Oil Review*, XLIII (2), April, 1959, 14-18). The history and development of Frontier College. Illustrated.

V. RELIGIOUS HISTORY

- CARRIÈRE, GASTON. Essai de toponymie oblate canadienne: en marge d'un anniversaire (*Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa*, XXVIII (3), juillet-sept. 1958, 364-94; XXVIII (4), oct.-déc. 1958, 522-31; XXIX (1), jan.-mars 1959, 92-108; XXIX (2), avril-juin 1959, 233-46).
- LAMIRANDE, EMILIEN. L'implantation de l'église canadienne en Colombie-Britannique (1838-1848) (*Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa*, XXVIII (2), avril-juin 1958, 213-25; XXVIII (3), juillet-sept. 1958, 323-63; XXVIII (4), oct.-déc. 1958, 453-489).
- LAPONCE, J. A. The Religious Background of Canadian M.P.'s (*Political Studies*, VI (3), Oct., 1958, 253-8). An analysis of the religious affiliations of Canadian M.P.'s, 1911-53.
- McLELLAND, JOSEPH C. The Macdonnell Heresy Trial (*Canadian Journal of Theology*, IV (4), Oct. 1958, 273-84). The author discusses the trial of Rev. D. J. Macdonnell of St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church in Toronto in 1877 arising out of a sermon on universalism which he delivered in 1875.
- VAN STEEN, MARCUS. Brantford's Royal Chapel (*Canadian Geographic Journal*, LVII (4), Oct., 1958, 136-41). The history of "Her Majesty's Chapel of the Mohawks" at Brantford.

VI. GENEALOGY

- BERGERON, ADRIEN. Le Cadastre acadien d'une paroisse du Québec en 1847 (*Mémoires de la Société généalogique canadienne-française*, VIII (1), jan. 1957, 46-50; VIII (3), juillet 1957, 172-8; IX (3 et 4), juillet et oct. 1958, 192-205).
- BORDUAS, J.-RODOLPHE. La Généalogie science inutile? (*Mémoires de la Société généalogique canadienne-française*, IX (2), avril 1958, 65-72). The author explains and defends the rôle of the genealogist.
- LEFEBVRE, JEAN-JACQUES. Louise Réaume-Fournerie-Robertson (1742-1773) et son petit-fils le Colonel Daniel de Hertel (1797-1866) (*R.H.A.F.*, XII (3), déc. 1958, 323-34). L'histoire de Louise Réaume et sa descendance.
- Mémoires de la Société généalogique canadienne-française*, IX (2), avril 1958, contains the following articles: "Les Méthodes de faire un tableau généalogique ascendant"; "Deux Histoires de 'cassettes'"; "Engagés pour le Canada, 1658"; and studies on les Gaultier; Jean Daniau; René Boudin; Marin Dalleret; and Jacques Schenck; IX (3 et 4), juillet et oct. 1958, contains the following articles: "Relevé Sommaire des paroisses fondées avant 1800"; "Bibliographie raisonnée de l'anthroponymie canadienne"; "Les Familles souches de St-Grégoire de Nicolet"; "L'Emigration lyonnaise (1632-1760)"; "Généalogie des familles de Detroit (H-Z)"; and studies on François Frigon; Pierre-Honoré Joubert; Jean Petit et Marie Carette.

VII. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BELISLE, LOUISE-ALEXANDRE, ed. *Le Dictionnaire général de la langue française au Canada*. Québec: Belisle, Editeur. 1958. Pp. xvi, 1390, illus. \$25.00.

- MURRAY, ALEX L. *The Provincial Freeman: A New Source for the History of the Negro in Canada* (*Ontario History*, LI (1), winter, 1959, 25-32). The author describes his discovery of the only known collection of this newspaper, now on microfilm in the Ontario Archives.
- TUREK, VICTOR. *Polonica Canadiana: A Bibliographical List of the Canadian Polish Imprints, 1848-1957*. Foreword by ROBERT H. BLACKBURN. Polish Research Institute in Canada. Toronto: Polish Alliance Press Limited. 1958. Pp. 138. \$1.50.
- WATTERS, REGINALD EYRE. *A Check List of Canadian Literature and Background Materials, 1628-1950*. Compiled for the Humanities Research Council of Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1959. Pp. xx, 789. \$15.00. "Being a Comprehensive List of the Books which constitute Canadian Literature written in English, together with a Selective List of Other Books by Canadian Authors which reveal the Backgrounds of that Literature."

VIII. ARTS AND SCIENCES

(1) Literature, Art, and Music

- BECKWITH, JOHN. Jean Papineau-Couture (*Canadian Music Journal*, III (2), winter, 1959, 4-20).
- BOONE, MAURICE P., and GAMMON, DONALD B. The Audubon Mystery (*Atlantic Advocate*, XLIX (7), March, 1959, 65-70). A discussion of the origins of the Audubon books in the Legislative Library in Fredericton, N.B. Illustrated.
- BOURDON, JEAN. *Plans of the First French Settlements on the St. Lawrence, 1635-1642*. Montreal: McGill University Library. 1958. Folio of plans. \$12.50.
- CARPENTER, EDMUND, VARLEY, FREDERICK, and FLAHERTY, ROBERT. *Eskimo*. Explorations, no. 9. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1959. Unnumbered. \$4.95. Illustrations and text.
- COGSWELL, FRED. Moses Hardy Nickerson: A Study (*Dalhousie Review*, XXXVIII (4), winter, 1959, 472-85).
- DUDEK, LOUIS. Patterns of Recent Canadian Poetry (*Culture*, XIX (4), déc. 1958, 399-415).
- HUDEN, JOHN C. Historical Champlain Maps (*Vermont History*, XXVII (1), Jan., 1959, 34-40). A discussion of early maps of the Lake Champlain-St. Lawrence area. Maps.
- JACKSON, A. Y. *A Painter's Country: The Autobiography of A. Y. Jackson*. Toronto: Clarke, Irwin & Company Limited. 1958. Pp. xvi, 170, illus. \$5.00.
- KILBOURN, W. M. Epilogue to *The Firebrand* (*Waterloo Review*, winter, 1959, 55-6). An epilogue to be included in the English edition of Professor Kilbourn's book.
- MAGEE, WILLIAM H. Local Colour in Canadian Fiction (*University of Toronto Quarterly*, XXVIII (2), Jan., 1959, 176-89).
- PILON, JEAN-GUY. Situation de l'édition au Canada français (*Revue de l'Université Laval*, XIII (6), fév. 1959, 503-7).
- PLANTE, JEAN-PAUL. Aperçu Biographique d'un poète canadien: Paul Morin (*Culture*, XIX (4), déc. 1958, 416-18).
- WILLIAMS, A. P. Canadian Coins (*Canadian Geographical Journal*, LVIII (3), March, 1959, 72-81). The history of Canadian coinage. Illustrated.

Notes and Comments

NOVA SCOTIA'S BICENTENNIAL

BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATIONS proposed for certain Nova Scotia communities this year remind us of the events of 1759. By that time New Englanders in considerable numbers disclosed their interest in removal to Nova Scotia. Four years had elapsed since the deportation of most of the Acadians; the obstacle of constitutional incompleteness had been eradicated by the convening of the first House of Assembly on October 2, 1758; the impediment of insecurity had been removed in part by the capture of Louisbourg in 1758 and was to be further removed in 1759 and 1760, as well as by the treaty ending the Seven Years' War. The desire of the authorities to fill up the vacated and the vacant lands was frustrated in some degree by the refusal of the New England troops who had been recruited for the campaign against Beauséjour to remain in the province. It was manifested also in the proclamations of October 12, 1758 and January 11, 1759, inviting New Englanders and offering terms of settlement. These proclamations evoked much interest in New England, with the result that agents were sent into Nova Scotia, lands were inspected, and township grants were issued by the authorities in the year 1759, not only for agricultural settlements in the Annapolis Valley, along Minas Basin, and across the Isthmus of Chignecto, but also for Shoreham (Chester), Liverpool, Tinmouth (New Dublin), Barrington, and Yarmouth.

These developments heralded an influx of some eight thousand New Englanders by 1765 who transformed Nova Scotia from a military outpost into virtually a self-supporting colony and laid abiding foundations in it. Concern over the outcome of the siege of Quebec and havoc wrought by gales to the dykes in November 1759 led to a postponement of the arrival of the New England planters until the spring of 1760. Few, if any, of the fishermen and lumbermen settled along the South Shore until the same time. But the local tradition at Liverpool is that a few who had been coming there from Cape Cod for some years previous to 1759, chiefly to net salmon in the river, but also to catch cod in the bay, built houses at Liverpool in that year and were the first of the New Englanders to winter there. There is documentary evidence, however, to show that on December 11, 1759, Joseph Patten and Thomas Foster, "a Committee for the Proprietors of the Township of Liverpool, at Port Seignior, &ca," who were then at Halifax, submitted a memorial to the authorities asking that transportation and some allowance of provisions should be given by the government to the fishermen and farmers intending to settle at Liverpool. On May 11, 1760, moreover, Governor Lawrence reported that he had sent Charles Morris, the surveyor, along the coast to the westward to lay out and adjust the limits of the townships for fishery, at one of which, namely Liverpool, there had already arrived fifty families and six fishing schooners. Later on, it may be added, Morris stated that the town of Liverpool was begun in 1760.

In the case of Chester the local tradition is also that settlement began in 1759. Like Liverpool, in any event, it is clear that the area was inspected and the township granted in that year. To the extent, however, that the date of com-

mencement of the town depends upon dates attributed to the first entries in the Rev. John Seccombe's Diary, proof is lacking that the year was 1759; for careful examination of that diary convinces me that some of the dates recorded in it have been doctored to show his arrival in 1759 rather than in 1761. The days of the month recorded in this journal fit the latter not the former year. For instance, the first entry, under the heading "July 1759" is "30 Thursday"; but in 1759 the last Thursday in July was the twenty-sixth; in 1760 it was the thirty-first; and in 1761 it was the thirtieth. It must be made clear, however, that there were settlers at Chester before the arrival of Seccombe. Morris says that this township was begun in 1760; and Belcher, who was then the administrator, reported on December 12, 1760, with respect to both Chester and Dublin, that "as they did not contract early in the year, but a few proprietors are yet come to each of them. . . ."

As for Barrington, preliminary steps were taken in 1759. Not only was it granted to two hundred proprietors in that year, but a committee of men from New England were conveyed from Halifax to Cape Sable by Captain Sylvanus Cobb in the provincial sloop *York* to view the lands in July. The ardour of this committee was apparently cooled by the reception given them in that area by a number of Acadians and Indians who fired upon them. Settlement did not begin until 1761, although family traditions differ—one says 1760, another 1761.

In the case of Yarmouth the story of migration is similar. For many years the harbours of Yarmouth and Chebogue were the resort of New England fishermen. On September 1, 1759 the first grant of the township of Yarmouth was issued. But it was not taken up; later other grants were made; and in 1761 settlement began.

[C. BRUCE FERGUSSON]

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

MICHEL BRUNET is Associate Professor of the Institut d'histoire, Université de Montréal.

J. K. McCONICA is Assistant Professor of History at the University of Saskatchewan.

FRANK H. UNDERHILL, former Professor of History at the University of Toronto, is Curator of Laurier House, Ottawa, and the editor of the most recent volume published by the Royal Society of Canada, *The Canadian Northwest: Its Potentialities* (1959).

GLYNDWR WILLIAMS is a research fellow at the Institute of Historical Research, University of London.

W. W. PIEPENBURG is Lecturer in History at the University of Toronto.

ROBERT H. MCNEAL is Assistant Professor of History at the University of Alberta.

